

DAILY REPORT

Soviet Union

Vol III No 023

4 February 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Editorial Article on European Aspect of Arms Problem [PRAVDA 4 Feb]	AA 1
Panel Discusses Aims, Highlights of New Proposal [Kalyagin, Petrovskiy, Sagdeyev, Chervov]	AA 4
Velikhov Evaluates Consequences of Nuclear War [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 22 Jan]	AA 15
Lomeyko Praises Soviet Disarmament Stand [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 22 Jan]	AA 16
'Cynicism, Hypocrisy' Cited in U.S. Arms Control [Bogachev]	AA 20

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions and Answers' [Kasparov, Levchenko]	CC 1
PRAVDA Review of Week's International Events [Prozhogin, 2 Feb]	CC 3

UNITED STATES & CANADA

More Reports on Shuttle Challenger Disaster	A 1
Indian Press Comments Cited [Myakota]	A 1
Sensors Removed Before Catastrophe	A 1
Space Programs To Continue	A 2
Commission To Study Explosion	A 2
Criticism of Vice-President's Speech Continues	A 2
Speech Exposes Platform [PRAVDA 3 Feb]	A 2
Bush Supports SDI [Myakota]	A 3
Congress' Attitude to Peace Initiatives Viewed [Zholkver]	A 3
PRAVDA Disclaims Soviet Role in PDRY Events [31 Jan]	A 4
More Commentary on Savimbi's Washington Visit	A 5
PRAVDA's Gan [3 Feb]	A 5
Reshetnikov	A 6
Commentators View U.S. Policy Toward Contras	A 7
Expanded Aid Planned [Ignatyev]	A 7
'Provisional Government' Plan Approved [Kudryavskiy]	A 8
CIA Report Termed 'Fabrication' [Lyutyy]	A 8

Gromyko Receives Vance, Discusses Relations	A 9
U.S. Interest in Philippines' Elections Examined [Mnatsakanov]	A 11

NORTHEAST ASIA

TRUD Reports on Trade Union Talks With Japanese [29 Jan]	C 1
Commentary Views U.S.-Japan Joint Military Action [Kondratyev]	C 1
Japanese Socialist Party Official on Ties With U.S. [Biryukov]	C 2
Murakhovskiy Visit to Mongolia Reported	C 3
Shevardnadze Visit to Japan Examined [Tsvetov]	C 3
MPRP Politburo Assesses Shevardnadze Visit [PRAVDA 30 Jan]	C 5
U.S. Military Deployment in ROK Criticized	C 5
Commentary Criticizes Upcoming 'Team Spirit-86' Exercise [Ruslanov]	C 6

SOUTH ASIA

Korniyenko, Delegation Visit Iran; Meet Khamene'i	D 1
Talks With Velayati [IRNA]	D 1
Meets With Musavi [Tehran]	D 1
Khamene'i Receives Korniyenko [IRNA]	D 1
Agree To Set Up Commission [Tehran]	D 2
'Frank, Constructive' Talks [IRNA]	D 2
PRAVDA Cites TASS on U.S. 'Hostile Attack' on DRA [3 Feb]	D 2
Beloshapko on Washington Seminar on Afghanistan	D 3
Fatherland Front Chairman Presents Plenum Report	D 3
TASS Interviews New Revolutionary Council Member [Baykov, Shabayev]	D 4
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on New DRA Jurists' Association [29 Jan]	D 5
Muslims' Statement in Defense of Pashtun Tribes	D 6

EASTERN EUROPE

Jaruzelski Cited on Significance of CPSU Congress [PRAVDA 2 Feb]	F 1
CSSR Trade Envoy Holds Press Briefing in Moscow [Bratislava]	F 1
Hungarian, Argentine Ministers Hold Budapest Talks	F 2

WESTERN EUROPE

France Expels 4 Soviet Diplomats; USSR Protests Reportedly GRU Members [Paris]	G 1
'Resolute Protest' to France	G 1
PRAVDA Cites Marchais on PCF Election Platform [1 Feb]	G 1
PRAVDA Reiterates Special Status of West Berlin [Zyubanov, 27 Jan]	G 2
Pashko Comments on Upcoming Spanish NATO Vote	G 3
TASS Notes Resumption of Papal Murder Plot Trial	G 4

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

USSR-Cuba-Angola Talks on Southern Africa Cited

J 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Further Reportage on Duvalier Crisis in Haiti

K 1

2d Fleet 'Close' to Haiti

K 1

Strike Paralyzes Capital

K 1

Nicaragua Protests Shultz Meeting With FDN

K 1

EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON EUROPEAN ASPECT OF ARMS PROBLEM

PM031651 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "The European Aspect"]

[Text] The program for the phased total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere on earth by the year 2000, with a ban on space strike arms, which was put forward in the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was received and is being discussed in Europe with exceptionally great interest. There have been responses of one kind or another by the governments of all the continent's states, their political forces, and the broadest circles of the public, antiwar movements, and the mass media. The European response is like a barometer reflecting the general weather of sentiments in the world. At the same time its resonance is clearly intensified by the "specific continental features." Namely, the European aspect of the nuclear problem.

This problem has been under discussion for many years. But as yet there have been no positive developments. On the contrary, security conditions on the continent are becoming worse and worse. And this dangerous development is taking place where both world conflagrations broke out and where the two mightiest military groupings face each other with their large arsenals of nuclear arms.

The notorious NATO "arms upgrading" program gave rise to a further buildup in these arsenals. Hundreds of new U.S. medium-range missiles have been installed in a number of West European countries. Contrary to the arguments of common sense and the national interests of the European peoples, the process of siting these first-strike weapons continues to this day. Naturally, this course of events is causing extreme concern among the peace-loving public and sensible political forces on the European Continent.

It is time to cut the Gordian knot and find a way out of the impasse. The European aspect of the Soviet nuclear disarmament plan proposes just such a bold, radical solution.

It is a question of achieving and implementing, in the first stage of the plan's implementation, a decision on the total elimination of the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone -- both ballistic and cruise missiles. And it is a question of doing this as a first step on the path toward the complete liberation of Europe from nuclear weapons.

The exceptional importance of this proposal both for Europe itself and for the whole world is obvious.

"If it was possible, without delay and without weighing the matter down with other problems, to eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles on our continent," M.S. Gorbachev noted, "We would, perhaps, have untied one of the most complex knots in present world policy and, to a considerable degree, cleared the way for a radical reduction in nuclear weapons and finally, their complete elimination."

In the European salient also, the Soviet initiative defines clear routes, guidelines, and concrete time frames. It takes into account the arguments and concepts put forward by the other European nuclear powers and the nuclear realities on our continent in general. In this connection many West European and also, in part, U.S. commentaries note not only its constructive nature, but also its genuinely innovative approach to the problem and practical suitability for attaining the great goal of liberating European soil from nuclear weapons.

There are precise time frames for the first step along this path. The elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone should take place within the period provided for by the first stage of the Soviet plan. And the relevant medium-range should be not merely "removed," but specifically destroyed. This would, therefore, be a real, cardinal measure toward nuclear disarmament in Europe, as a result of which there would be several hundred fewer missiles and more than 1,000 fewer of the corresponding charges here and indeed, in the world as a whole!

An important feature of the Soviet plan is that at the first stage it is oriented, first and foremost, toward the Soviet Union and the United States. Neither the French nor the British nuclear forces are included in the "Soviet-U.S. list" [vedomost].

However, it would be logical, in the course of resolving the question of eliminating medium-range missiles, for the United States to make a commitment not to deliver strategic missiles or medium-range missiles to other countries and for Britain and France not to build up their corresponding nuclear arms.

It is no secret that the nuclear potential of France and Britain is increasing rapidly. Given radical reductions in the corresponding Soviet and U.S. arms, this potential would account for an even more substantial "share" in the general balance of forces, particularly the European balance. As THE WASHINGTON POST observed the other day, "as the number of nuclear missiles belonging to all the nuclear powers comes closer together, it will become increasingly difficult to claim that the British and French deterrence potentials are small, special forces with no influence on the overall correlation of forces."

Official statements that France and Britain will be prepared to join in the nuclear disarmament process only after a substantial reduction in the nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States are well known.

In view of this it is proposed that other countries begin to reduce their nuclear arms only at the second stage, after the Soviet Union and the United States have reduced -- and not merely substantially, but radically, by half -- their nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory. Moreover, under the Soviet proposal, the reduction in the other countries' nuclear arsenals would begin with the destruction of tactical weapons at the second stage, while those nuclear arms which they themselves describe as strategic would be destroyed only at the third stage, simultaneously with the completion of the elimination of the Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals.

The Soviet program for Europe as a whole is drawn up in such a way that its implementation would not be detrimental to anyone's security at any stage. That is its great strength.

Europe is the common home of all the peoples inhabiting it, including the Soviet people. We have a vital interest in ensuring security and good-neighborliness there. Soviet efforts to eliminate the main -- nuclear -- threat on the continent are particularly persistent. Setting an example of goodwill, the Soviet Union unilaterally removed the SS-20 missiles additionally deployed in the European zone from operational readiness and dismantled the corresponding fixed installations for these missiles. The proposal made earlier by the Soviet Union to free Europe entirely from both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons remains valid.

During the Soviet top-level visit to France last October an important proposal by the Soviet Union was made public. It is aimed at facilitating an accord on the speediest mutual reduction of medium-range nuclear means. It provides for the possibility of concluding a corresponding agreement separately, unconnected with the problem of space and strategic arms.

It was then that the Soviet Union voiced its readiness for a direct discussion with France and Britain about nuclear affairs. The idea of an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe was discussed at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva, when points of contact in this sphere were detected. What we have here is a broad panorama of ideas, proposals, and approaches advanced by the Soviet Union to resolve the fundamental problem of European security. It attests to the sincerity and earnestness of our intentions.

There is no doubt, however, that the proposal to liquidate the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone is now assuming special significance. Given the sides' corresponding will, it can easily be implemented in practice. Having nothing to do with the U.S. "zero option," it does not infringe upon the sides' security interests and takes into account the wishes of the West European countries, above all, that a possible accord should embrace all the SS-20 missiles capable of hitting targets on West European territory. So the way to an accord is open in practice. The first step toward freeing the European Continent from nuclear weapons now depends only on the position and the political will of the other side.

The European aspect of the Soviet plan has excited minds on our continent. The novelty, importance, and significance of these proposals have been public recognized in almost all West European capitals. "The questions touched on in the package of Soviet proposals," FRG Foreign Minister H.D. Genscher declared, "not only concern the United States, but equally, and in many cases far more directly, concern Europeans. Recall, for example, the question of medium-range missiles..."

However, the clear and honest idea is being undermined. Citing "U.S. officials," the newspaper NEWSDAY, for example says that the Soviet action is motivated by a desire to "drive a wedge between the United States and its chief allies." And transatlantic sources are used to intimidate West Europeans by claiming that "in the absence of U.S. nuclear missiles Europe will be left to the mercy of the huge Soviet land army" (although, in reality, approximate equilibrium exists between the Warsaw Pact and NATO in this branch of the armed forces). The "argument" is also used that, having liquidated its missiles in the European zone, the Soviet Union could "easily and quickly" transfer them there from the country's distant Asian regions. If we adopt this logic, then the Americans could even more easily and quickly transfer their Pershing-2's to Western Europe, since they are delivered there by air from the United States even now. What we see here are blatant attempts to use "provisos" to drag out an important matter and bring it to a standstill.

However, we must not delay today. In order to halt the arms race once and for all and shift the course of international events to the path of peaceful development, it is necessary to act, and to act without delay, for everyone to act -- governments, parties, peoples. The proposal to liquidate medium-range missiles in Europe makes it possible to carry out a very important action in this direction and to advance the building of European security.

All conditions now exist on the European Continent for overcoming the disunity between East and West, particularly on questions of security and mutually advantageous cooperation. Europe is perfectly capable of giving its own "European answer" to the challenge of the time.

We would like to hope that Washington will objectively study and weigh the proposal for the liquidation of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles as the first step toward freeing the European continent from nuclear weapons. What is needed is a serious and businesslike reply, in order to begin drawing up the corresponding accord in practice. The peoples of Europe await it and it would benefit world security.

PANEL DISCUSSES AIMS, HIGHLIGHTS OF NEW PROPOSAL

LD032105 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1840 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Program entitled "Disarmament in the Name of Peace and Progress" presented by political observer Boris Kalyagin with Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium; Academician Roald Zinnurovich Sagdeyev, director of the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Colonel General Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, chief of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff; date and place not given -- live or recorded]

[Text] [Kalyagin] Hello, comrades! Nearly 3 weeks have passed since the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was published. The new peace proposals contained in the statement are now being closely studied. They are being analyzed and commented on by politicians and public figures, press organs, and radio and television observers of all persuasions and virtually all countries of the world. Such heightened interest is quite understandable, for the matter concerns things that worry everyone -- the future of mankind.

For the first time in history a detailed, specific, and realistic program with precisely calculated dates has been put forward for the complete and ubiquitous elimination of all nuclear weapons in this very century. The overwhelming majority of people have greeted these proposals with approval and hope. At the same time in the West, first and foremost in the United States, other voices are also being heard, such as that of those who would like to belittle the importance of the Soviet initiatives, to show up vulnerable spots in them, so to speak, which, they say, encroach on the interests of the West. Attempts are also being made to simply distort the meaning of individual Soviet proposals. Taking all this into account, in this program we would like to analyze the responses to the Soviet peace program and to dwell in more detail on those issues that are now being particularly inflated by Western propaganda organs.

So, what can be said on the whole about the reaction of foreign states? Which basic points should be singled out in this reaction? The first question is for you, Vladimir Fedorovich.

[Petrovskiy] I think that certainly when talking about the reaction to the set of new foreign policy initiatives that were put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 15 February this year, one must say that no one has remained indifferent to our initiatives. Of course, this reaction has not been uniform in various countries. Our friends in the socialist world have taken the Soviet proposals as a matter that concerns them very closely, as an important contribution to the realization of the common, concerted line of socialist countries that was worked out in Sofia and Prague.

The overwhelming majority of young, developing states are also greeting our peace initiatives and rightly believe that they do not only secure [corrects himself] that their realization not only guarantees security for all, but also creates prospects for eliminating such acute problems as the elimination of hunger, disease, debt, and economic backwardness. What is characteristic is that even in the West, nobody has decided to brush aside our proposals. Realistic-minded politicians, scientists, and public figures see in them a sign of a change for the better in international relations. However, even those circles in the West that usually immediately declare everything proposed by the Soviet Union to be propaganda -- even those circles have found themselves in a difficult position.

Boris Aleksandrovich, you ask which central points are singled out in the reaction.

I think that if one tries to summarize the characteristics that are being given to our proposals, they can be expressed as follows: First, the novelty of our proposals in all parameters is noted; second, the breadth of their scope; and third, their specific nature. However, it is also being noted that all of the Soviet proposals on disarmament are backed up by far-reaching verification measures and this will make it possible to guarantee observance of accords when they are concluded.

[Kalyagin] I would like to say a few more words about the stance of the United States -- for in many respects whether it will prove possible to reach an agreement on the complete elimination of nuclear weapons depends precisely on them. The U.S. President and the secretary of state came out immediately, as observers say, with considered, positive statements and greeted this step of ours; then a silence set in. This silence is continuing even now. I am getting the impression that U.S. Administration figures would like to calm public opinion with initial statements that do not commit them to anything and then gradually dispose of the matter quietly; give it to experts to study and drag out this study to infinity. What do you think?

[Petrovskiy] You are quite right that the reaction in the United States to our proposals is far from being unequivocal. A different attitude of principle, I would say, emerges on the part of certain U.S. circles to questions of war and peace, precisely in the reaction to our proposal. How are things to be done in the modern nuclear and space age? Are narrow egoistic interests to be placed higher than the interests of the international community, or should one be engaged in joint efforts to build general security and general peace?

I think the watershed of these questions lies between those who take up the stance of political realism and those who cling to the obsolete stereotypes of the past. Certainly, one can assume that a struggle is under way, that discussions are being held on these initiatives. But here, too, I would like to hope that, in the final analysis, good sense and understanding of the fact that, under current conditions, we now need to act together in the name of the main aim -- the elimination of the threat of nuclear war -- will prevail.

[Kalyagin] The Soviet extension of the moratorium on all nuclear tests for another 3 months gave rise to a wide reaction worldwide. Support is growing, including in the United States, from public and political circles for this step. Demonstrations have been stepped up in the United States, with direct calls on the White House to follow the Soviet example and stop nuclear explosions. However, the administration is against this and talks about the need to continue nuclear tests for the modernization of U.S. nuclear forces, which, they say, lag behind the Soviet Union in this sense. They even adduce the argument that the Soviet Union has completed its planned series of nuclear tests and that it will not be starting the next series earlier than the spring, so the Soviet Union, they say, can wait. Well, what do you have to say on these arguments, Roald Zinnurovich?

[Sagdeyev] Literally the day after our country announced the moratorium, arguments against it appeared overseas. They gave most varied reasons, including an alleged U.S. lag in the sphere of the development and perfection of nuclear weapons. They adduced the arguments that it cannot be verified. One must say that today, in the context of our plan for the global liquidation of nuclear weapons, the freezing of their qualitative standard, i.e., the cessation of all kinds of testing, is the first natural stage. I would even say that this is an essential entrance fee, a fee which our country has boldly, and with a feeling of very great responsibility, paid. The argument on verification [kontrol] has today been virtually removed from the agenda by our opponents because recently, particularly in the statement made by Mikhail Sergeyevich, it was very firmly stated that if any additional methods are needed, we are ready to consider them. There is no problem here. (?Verification is part of the process of a total ban on testing.)

As for the matter of the alleged state of lagging behind, we have to turn to statistics: Statistics on the number of nuclear tests carried out throughout the entire history of the atomic bomb and statistics on the number of nuclear tests in the past year, specifically during the time that followed our proclamation of a moratorium, of course, demonstrate on whose side the truth lies. It can be said that in all, the number of tests carried out in the Soviet Union throughout the whole period in all spheres is approximately 30 percent less than the number of tests carried out in the United States alone. I would like, all the same for this statistical data to become known to the U.S. taxpayer because then perhaps the voice of the electorate will get stronger.

[Chervov] According to the figures of the Swedish Defense Institute, which very scrupulously registers all nuclear explosions, it is now known that as of January 1986 the United States has carried out a total number of nuclear explosions that is greater than all the nuclear powers of the world put together. Here are the figures from the Swedish institute. [Video close-up on screen of a card Chervov is holding] We have shown them on a diagram which we are putting up for television viewers. The facts, as they say, are a stubborn thing. As for the seasonal nature of nuclear tests for the Soviet Union, this, to put it bluntly, an absurd argument. First, you know, we announced the unilateral moratorium in summer, in midsummer we embarked on this, having broken off our own program, and the U.S. side is perfectly aware of this. So it is not a question here of a seasonal nature, it is not a matter of any other arguments; the Americans simply have no arguments now. It must be directly stated that the rejection by the United States of stopping nuclear tests cannot be viewed as anything other than Washington's reluctance to put an end to the nuclear arms race.

[Kalyagin] Could you, by the way, say how many explosions the United States has carried out since we observed the moratorium?

[Chervov] In 1985, the U.S. side carried out 18 nuclear explosions, including nine after the moratorium, which is also shown on our diagram.

[Kalyagin] The so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan remains the stumbling block at the Geneva talks on limiting and reducing weapons. The White House clearly does not want to give up this program. It states that SDI allegedly does not represent a threat to the Soviet Union; that one is talking here not about the offensive, but purely defensive weapons; that they are targeted not against people, but against nuclear missiles only, and even then, only if they are used as a first-strike weapon during the launch. What can one say about that, Nikolay Fedorovich?

[Chervov] The U.S. Administration has been trying for almost 3 years to persuade other states, including its NATO allies, that the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative or "star wars" is useful and even necessary for mankind. Weinberger, the U.S. secretary of defense, even stated that the space means under development are not even weapons, they are merely harmless and inoffensive means. Such statements do not stand up to criticism. The space strike means being created in the United States are weapons and SDI is the transfer of the arms race into space. If SDI is implemented, space weapons will hang over all of mankind like the sword of damocles. The same Weinberger states bluntly, I quote from his statement: If we, i.e. the United States, will be able to obtain a system that will be efficient and will make the Soviet Union's weapons inefficient, we will then be returning to the situation when the United States was the only country with nuclear weapons.

It cannot be expressed more clearly: SDI is the U.S. drive to achieve through space decisive military superiority.

First, the space strike weapons in tandem with the strategic offensive weapons increase an offensive potential and give the offensive potential and the strategic offensive weapons the capability of an unpunished first strike with the purpose of maximally weakening the response strike. Second, the space strike weapons can be used for hitting objects in space, i.e., for sudden destruction of the major space apparatus of the other side with the purpose of blinding, catching it unprepared, and, in this way, undermining it or rendering it fully incapable of countermeasures after a nuclear attack by the other side. Third, the space strike means have a range of 4,000, 5,000 and more kilometers. The question is: What sort of a defensive weapon is it with such a range? It is, in fact a universal weapon.

Such weapons can be used for achieving offensive objectives, in particular, in order to strike from space ground-based objects: airfields, oil stores, power stations, dams, agricultural fields, etc. In the opinion of U.S. scientists, the laser systems being created in accordance with the "star wars" program will be capable of destroying a major city in a matter of several minutes and in several hours, population centers of an entire country. Industrially developed states will be thrown back to the Middle Ages; large-scale fires will be created which will lead to an ecological disaster similar to the nuclear winter. Is it really a defensive weapon?

Furthermore, the space strike weapons are capable of achieving first-strike objectives. They are, according to the Western experts' assertion, capable of destroying missiles in their silos, i.e., putting the enemy's missiles out of action even before they are launched. In a word, not a shield, but a space sword is being created and that is the military essence of SDI or "star wars." The U.S. Administration is projecting only one side of the space strike weapons in its propaganda -- namely, their capability of achieving defensive objectives -- and about the fact that they are intended to strike objects on land, in space, and on the sea, on their capability of achieving offensive objectives, the U.S. Administration keeps silent.

[Kalyagin] There is another such argument in Washington, that SDI is, supposedly, only research and research cannot be monitored or banned, everyone carries out research, and that this program does not violate the current Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting anti-missile defenses; hence, it cannot be an obstacle to radical reductions in nuclear missiles.

[Chervov] Work on the SDI program is now proceeding very intensively, especially on the creation of surveillance, tracking, and pointing systems, directed energy weapons, kinetic energy weapons -- mostly earth and space-based antimissile and combat control systems. Most of the aforementioned work is at the stage of experimental development and the creation of demonstration mock-ups and models. These actions contradict the spirit of the ABM Treaty -- Antiballistic Missile Treaty. Some of these actions -- for example, the tests that the United States carried out, -- specifically, the test of an X-ray laser away from testing grounds agreed upon by the ABM Treaty -- are a direct violation of the 1972 treaty. Taking part in the SDI operations are the major military-industrial corporations of the United States, universities, laboratories of leading firms, and private research organizations.

It is conceivable that the United States would spend \$26 billion on research -- they are planning for 5 years -- and then suddenly renounce the idea of "star wars," put a stop to it simply because the Russians won't agree to its deployment? You will recall that the United States spent \$15 billion on the Manhattan Project for the creation of nuclear weapons. For this reason it is laughable to even think that \$26 billion are needed merely to resolve a theoretical question of whether it is possible or impossible to create offensive space weapons. The same Weinberger on this score rudely pushes Mother Truth aside, as they say. He has stated directly that "I exclude the possibility of renouncing the Strategic Defense Initiative, both in the research stage and in the deployment stage."

Meanwhile, a radical reduction in nuclear arms is impossible without a ban on offensive space weapons. On the contrary, it would be necessary to develop and improve them. The Soviet Union and the United States understood this truth splendidly in the 1970's. Now the U.S. Administration is denying it.

[Kalayagin] Certain figures in the West are saying that, well, if the U.S. President and the U.S. Administration want to create an antimissile space shield so much -- and I am using their terminology, although it is of course, an offensive weapon -- then why not do this. The United States would create its space shield. There would be two shields. There would be a certain balance and this way it would be possible to combine both Reagan's SDI and the Soviet peace program for the elimination of nuclear weapons. What do you think about such arguments?

[Chervov] Such arguments...even if you can imagine space shields being created simultaneously in the United States and the Soviet Union, it would be a very, very unstable, a critical situation. This idea consists of the following: If one side deploys offensive and defensive systems and the other side has only offensive systems, then the first side acquires a significant strategic superiority. It acquires the possibility of inflicting a disarming nuclear strike. In such a situation, nothing is left for the second side to do other than develop its strategic offensive weapons. In such a situation, the reduction of strategic offensive weapons loses its meaning. However, in the case of both sides having offensive and defensive systems, that is, space shields ago, it would also become worse than if the sides had only offensive weapons. Calculations show that even an insignificant, minor advantage by one of the sides in the effectiveness of its space shield, in the effectiveness of its defensive systems would immediately destabilize the whole situation. Such a situation would also be preserved in the case of both sides reducing their nuclear armaments, since, in this situation, nuclear weapons would no longer have an influence on the situation and the strategic situation would be dictated by space shields. Strategic weapons would no longer be able to guarantee the security of each of the sides, especially when one of the sides clearly wants to acquire an advantage in defensive systems, in a space shield as the result of technology, such as the United States is striving for now.

[Kalygin] So there would be a complete destabilization of the situation, it seems?

[Chervov] At his press conference in Geneva, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev cited an original example of the situation of both sides having space shields. I shall permit myself to cite this example. Let's imagine what consequences would be brought by even an accidental collision in space. Let's say something falls off a rocket; the warhead part, so to speak, goes its way, while the carrier part falls away and crashes into some group belonging to this space weaponry. All the computers go into action, while the politicians cannot do anything sensible at all in this instance. Well, are we to find ourselves in the power of these events?

[Kalyagin] Apropos the recent tragedy that destroyed the American Challenger spacecraft; evidently, this provides additional material for some kind of reflection.

[Chervov] Yes, for if this tragic event had occurred when both sides had space shields, then the computers of the U.S. space shield would have gone into action immediately. And how would that have ended up? In conclusion on this issue, I would like to stress the following: The joint deployment of space shields is a false road which creates the illusion of strengthening the security of the sides, but which in fact undermines it.

[Sagdeyev] Sometimes the supporters of SDI try to persuade everyone. They say let's undertake research, and then development, and even if nothing comes of it, there will be some other, useful outcome; it might be commercial, it might be in civil technologies.

This kind of spinoff has come to be called a by-product in English. If we now come back to the question of the reliability of two mirror image space shields, what can be said? As Nikolay Fedorovich has already mentioned, the firepower of each of the shields is so great that, first of all, one is struck by the by-product in this sphere: It turns out that in order to destroy a mirror image space shield of the opposing side according to a prepared scenario and in a very short time, one need only expend one tenth of the firepower of one's own shield, as the calculations show. Thus, regardless of who invested the technology and funds in deploying the shield, whether it is thanks to one's own national resources or whether it has been done thanks to a generous gift from the other side -- as you know, there have been proposals to share technology of late...

[Kalyagin interrupting] True, and the Americans don't even offer this to their Western partners.

[Chervov] And Weinberger said that the technology might be shared when the Americans have already created their shield.

[Sagdeyev] Well, in a matter of seconds, this precious gift will be destroyed. Thanks very much, I'm sure! So far, one cannot see any other by-product here. And really, can one seriously think that such hypertrophied lasers being made with the intention of attacking and destroying targets at a distance of several thousand kilometers will be able to find some sensible application in medicine? For delicate surgery, or for process operations in industry? The same applies to the completely hypertrophied, distorted types of computer systems spoken of in the context of the SDI program. I agree completely with Nikolay Fedorovich, that guaranteeing reliability of such a very complex, super-complex system, on a purely technological level, represents an exceptionally complex, problematical and, I would say, simply impossible task.

Getting away from the space technology, the flying devices, and looking at the reliability of the computer system which the SDI supporters expect to build, what are we discussing? It has to be a computer system holding in its memory, in its programs, instructions and codes put there beforehand telling it how the system has to act in case of this or that situation arising. Well, the situation here is extremely complicated, it means tens of thousands, or, taking decoys into account, even hundreds of thousands of bodies flying through space. And so it turns out that the size of the programs, the quantity of these instructions, has to be reckoned in tens of millions of lines. It is not possible to create a faultless set of commands in advance; in situ tests are required. I think everyone would like to avoid such global in situ tests which would turn not just into a tragedy such as that of Challenger, but a tragedy many times greater.

[Kalyagin] Since we are now studying the question of the consequences of implementing the SDI program in such detail, I want to quote another argument which the U.S. President himself expressed. He produced the following justification on the space score: In conversation with Soviet journalists he said, I quote, that it is possible that a situation may arise where somewhere in the world some madman will try once again to create nuclear offensive weapons in order to use them for blackmail. In that event, the existence of an antimissile space shield will allow us all to rest easy. What do you think of such an unexpected argument?

[Sagdeyev] If one considers the volume of material expenditure and the quantity of equipment, the most complex equipment which may also have the ability to make a first strike, I think you'll get tens of thousands, perhaps even hundreds of thousands of metric tons of most complex equipment only in orbit, in space. All that against one madman who will most probably choose another method -- a fishing boat or simply a truck.

[Kalyagin] One could dream up dozens of such circumstances for justification. For example, they talk of aliens from other worlds... But let us return to our peace initiatives. The first stage of the Soviet program for nuclear disarmament concerns first and foremost the Soviet Union and the United States. In what form and when would it be desirable to get the other nuclear powers to join them. What do you think, Vladimir Fedorovich?

[Petrovskiy] You were quite right to note that the first stage basically concerns the Soviet Union and the United States. At the same time, in our program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the beginning of the third millennium there is set out a minutely elaborated and, I would say, considered order or bringing the other nuclear states into the process of nuclear disarmament. In this matter we also took account of the wishes and feelings in these states. After all, as is known, the leaders of Britain, France, and China have declared on more than one occasion that their countries will be ready to take part in nuclear disarmament at a time when the Soviet Union and the United States substantially reduce their arsenals.

Precisely taking those circumstance into account, our program indeed proposes that the remaining nuclear powers should start reducing their nuclear weapons at the second stage of the program, which will start in 1990, after the United States and the Soviet Union have reduced -- and reduced not only substantially, but by half -- their strategic and other nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory. It is also a matter of appropriate mechanisms, say for achieving Soviet-U.S. accord on such a reduction. It is entirely reasonable to make use of the already existing mechanism of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons which are being conducted in Geneva. Later on, probably, as other nuclear states join in nuclear disarmament, it is not ruled out that the need will arise for some other forums.

[Chervov] I wanted to add two words.

[Kalyagin] Fine, of course.

[Chervov] Concerning the other nuclear powers: They reduce their nuclear weapons at the second stage -- only tactical nuclear weapons, only tactical, with a range not above 1,000 km or less, while the nuclear weapons which they call strategic will start to be reduced at the third stage, in effect starting from 1995. Therein lies the fundamental special nature of the Soviet program for nuclear disarmament, that it does not affect, does not damage the security interests of other states.

[Kalyagin] In the West, voices are also being heard saying that your proposals for a full elimination of nuclear weapons hide a secret trap -- that if all nuclear weapons are destroyed, so it goes, then the Soviet Union will obtain superiority for conventional weapons. This is especially frequently said in the context of Europe. How do you see it?

[Chervov] Boris Aleksandrovich, this is not a new question. There is no superiority in conventional weapons on the side of the Warsaw Pact. In the first place, the NATO countries have more, almost 500,000 more numbers of Armed Forces. The population of the NATO countries is half as big again as that of the Warsaw Pact, and this means that in reserve contingents the superiority is clearly on the side of NATO. The production capacities of NATO's military industry is considerably greater than that of the Warsaw Pact. NATO has more tactical nuclear weapons. NATO has at its disposal colossal conventional armed forces, possessing a considerable superiority over the Warsaw Pact in a whole range of weapons and means. I shall quote you some examples. Take, for example, the number of combat-ready divisions, which are immediately ready for military actions without being deployed. In Europe NATO has 94 combat-ready divisions, counting France and Spain. The Warsaw Pact has 78 divisions.

The number of U.S. divisions deployed is approximately 19,000 men; FRG divisions, on the order of 24,000; the divisions of the Warsaw Pact number about 11-12,000 men. There is a clear superiority on the side of NATO for combat-ready divisions.

But the NATO people never do cite this example. They fail to mention it, because it is disadvantageous for them to speak of it. They overemphasize and usually inflate the issue about tanks. What is this about? When it is to their advantage, U.S. and NATO leaders count up only those tanks that are at the disposal of the united NATO command, that is, at the disposal of Rogers, and give a figure now of 16,000-18,000 although in point of fact Rogers has more than 20,000 tanks. These are just the ones at the disposal of the NATO command. Apart from this, however, there are around 2,500 U.S. tanks concentrated at depots in Europe. These are for dual-based formations -- the personnel are deployed and the weapons are kept in storage. Apart from this, there are nearly 6,000 tanks for the armed forces of West European countries. That is to say, that NATO is not inferior to the Warsaw Pact in the overall number of tanks. NATO is superior to the Warsaw Pact in antitank weapons. The amount of artillery it has is approximately equal to the Warsaw Pact's. It is true that NATO is somewhat inferior to the Warsaw Pact in the number of tactical air force craft.

On the whole, we believe there is an approximate balance in conventional arms. The London Strategic Studies Institute -- which can in no way be considered pro-Soviet -- came to the following conclusion for 1985 after profound analysis: In conventional arms, the balance between NATO and the Warsaw Pact -- this is noted in the institute's studies -- is, as before, such that it renders a military offensive a very risky undertaking, since neither of the sides has at its disposal the combined might to guarantee victory. Besides, as you know, the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev openly says that, along with the removal of mass destruction weapons from states' arsenals, the Soviet Union is proposing that conventional arms and armed forces should become the subject of agreed reductions. An accord at the Vienna talks could become the signal for the start of movement in this direction. Thus, the Soviet proposal for eliminating nuclear weapons does not contain any hidden obstacles as regards Europe.

[Petrovskiy] Boris Aleksandrovich, I would also like to turn attention to the diplomatic side of this matter. In NATO countries at present noise is beginning to be made about conventional arms. In fact, however, these countries are doing nothing toward putting into action the process of reducing conventional arms and armed forces. Nikolay Fedorovich has just mentioned the proposals that have been made many times by Warsaw Pact states on limiting and reducing conventional arms. However, we have not as yet received a reply to these proposals. What's more, I will say, this is what they are saying about conventional arms, the conventional arms in central Europe, at the talks which deal with the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms precisely in the center of Europe: At the talks in Vienna the Western participants are refusing to talk about reducing arms, although the reduction of arms is also the subject of an agreed accord...

[Chervov, interjecting] ...and the mandate of the Vienna talks.

[Petrovskiy] And the mandate, definitely the mandate, you are quite right. Or here is a final example. On many occasions, the UN General Assembly has demanded that a convention banning or limiting the use of certain specific types of conventional weapons which can be considered detrimental, but put into action, should enter into force. And why has this convention not entered into force? Only because, despite the insistent calls by the United Nations, NATO countries are still stubbornly refusing to ratify this convention. Here, as they say, this speaks for itself from the diplomatic point of view.

[Kalyagin] It's generally accepted that questions of disarmament and arms reduction are key issues in Soviet-U.S. relations. The improvement of our bilateral links depends on them in many respects. Certain U.S. observers also point to a reverse dependence: the improvement of bilateral links may result in the growth of trust and facilitate the solution of security problems. In this connection, I would like to ask, what further steps can be taken by our countries to expand Soviet-U.S. bilateral relations.

[Petrovskiy] Boris Aleksandrovich, I would like to say first and foremost that you are quite right. Indeed, questions of security and, first and foremost, of the reduction of arms -- which is the main road to security -- really are key issues in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. And strictly speaking, this conception has been reflected in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement.

Incidentally, when President Reagan himself was speaking, touching on the most important questions of our century, he brought precisely the reduction of the enormous nuclear arsenals of the two sides, the Soviet Union and the United States that is, to the forefront. True, it must be said that he spoke about this without any connection to a ban on space arms. And we proceed from the fact that the full realization of the accords reached in Geneva -- and in other directions of Soviet-U.S. cooperation such as agreement about exchanges and contacts in the spheres of science, education, and culture -- would, of course, be much easier in conditions where questions of security begin to be resolved. But such accords would indubitably serve as a good basis for raising the level of trust between our countries.

[Sagdeyev] Of the whole range of possibilities for strengthening and developing bilateral relations -- trade, cultural exchange -- scientific exchange is the one closest to me. I would like to say that this sphere could open up for us absolutely vast prospects; for instead of space militarization, the two countries could do a very great deal together in space for peaceful purposes. It would be possible to organize bit space projects -- not only space projects, but earthly ones too -- directed toward solving very important ecological problems -- problems of studying the world's oceans and the preservation of the world's oceans, problems of long-distance space flights. Incidentally, a whole group of my U.S. colleagues actively advocate the direction of efforts in space precisely along peaceful lines, specifically proposing even such an outstanding project as a joint manned flight to Mars. That, of course, is not a matter for tomorrow, but why should we not begin to move with specific, albeit not very big, steps? The accord that was reached at the summit in Geneva to maintain worldwide efforts in thermonuclear power engineering, to propose that other countries take part in the international project for the development of the Tokamak device for a new generation of thermonuclear power engineering is already one weighty step.

The accords on the exchange of mathematical programs for school computers are interesting, because it happens that precisely now, during the present years, intensive computerization of school education is being carried out, both there and with us. These contacts would draw the younger generation, the schoolchildren, those who will have to carry on building and taking care of our big planet, into a sphere conducive to friendly relations.

[Kalyagin] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement proposes also putting a ban on the creation of a new kind of non-nuclear weapons based on new principles of physics in the process of liquidation of nuclear weapons. Nikolay Fedorovich, could you tell us in more detail what the new kind of weapons are and whether the Strategic Defense Initiative envisages the creation of such a weapon?

[Chervov] Non-nuclear weapons based on new principles of physics are the kind of weapon that uses principles of physics that have not previously been applied to strike at people and other targets.

It is no less dangerous in its strike capabilities than nuclear, or, say, chemical weapons. The Soviet Union believes it essential to establish a ban on their development. At the present time it would be possible to include the following among such weapons: beam weapons, based on the use of a powerful quantum, photon, or electromagnetic radiation flux; a flow of charged or neutral particles, electrons, protons, neutral atoms to hit biological and other targets. Laser and accelerator weapons are a variety of beam weapons: a flow of elementary particles accelerated to relativistic speeds, or up to the speed of light. Laser and accelerator weapons are an integral part of the SDI program. Laser weapons are the heart of "star wars."

Among the new kinds of weapons based on new principles of physics are radio wave weapons, based on the effect of electromagnetic modes in the radio wave spectrum on people, as well as on weapons and equipment. Infra-sound weapons. This is a weapon based on the use of guided radiation from powerful infrasound generators to act on the living organism. This effect happens through the acoustic resonance of extremely low --- and low audio frequencies in the human body.

Genetic weapons are based on the effect of new or hybrid biological agents on living organisms. These are pathogens of diseases which are obtained not by the usual traditional methods, but by methods of molecular biology and genetic engineering. A variety of genetic weapons are ethnic weapons, chemical or biological, for selective attack against individual ethnic groups of a population. According to data in the foreign press, special genetic laboratories, which exist in the United States, Great Britain, the FRG, and Japan, are working on the development of formulations for such pathogens.

[Unidentified voice] A threat to whole peoples arises.

[Chervov] Yes, exactly.

[Kalyagin] Some observers are putting this sort of question at the moment: What if, after all, it should not prove possible to convince the present Washington administration? If they should begin to implement its programme, what will the Soviet Union's reply be? How will our country act?

[Sagdeyev] I think that, overall, of course, the security of the whole world, the security not only of our country, but of the United States itself, will be fundamentally undermined by such a step if it is taken. But for the restoration of strategic balance, for the restoration of parity, steps in response will undoubtedly be taken. There are many possibilities. We have already spoken today about how dangerous and unstable the balance would become if a mirror, symmetric space shield system should come about. Other measures also exist; considerably more effective measures, more simple and cheap. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke about this in particular at the press conference in Geneva after the completion of the meeting with the Americans. But among specific measures I could name some of those which were the object of analysis by broad circles of the international scientific public within the framework of the antiwar movement. These are measures of counteraction, based on giving offensive weapons more tenacity, the capability of penetrating space shields; measures of an active nature, which would exploit the extreme vulnerability of the space echelons of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. Well, I don't think that this question -- discussion of this question -- should be forced, because there remains time to take a reasonable and sober decision. Our proposals have now been laid on the table.

[Kalyagin] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke of the need for new thinking in the policies of states. He even called inertness of thought, its lagging behind the quickly changing world, one of the real obstacles on the road to radical disarmament.

In connection with this I would like to draw your attention to the fact that certain figures in the West have started to talk about the utopian nature of the Soviet program, saying that it is hardly feasible in practice. In the past, they say, plans of this type for all-embracing disarmament have already been discussed, and every time they failed to lead to success because of their integrated nature. Are their arguments of this type simply an indication that certain figures in the West do not wish to part with old forms of thinking?

[Petrovskiy] Well, I will begin with the fact that in the past, in the history of disarmament talks, there was never any program of such a type. The program for the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of our millennium, put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, is unprecedented in diplomatic and political history. This program is distinguished not only by its comprehensive character, but by profound study of all details, by its specific character. You are perfectly right about those who speak about the utopian nature of this program; they are continuing to think in the categories of the past, pre-nuclear era, when it was thought by some people -- and on the whole this point of view was current both in political and in military theory -- that security must be secured with the help of military force.

Our nuclear and space era has completely overturned these notions. The point is that the current period in the development of international relations is characterized by the fact that such weapons have been created which can lead mankind to self-destruction. At the same time, on a vast scale, the mutual dependence, mutual connections of states has grown, states which continue to retain their own interests, their own policies, their own traditions. Not to see these new realities, to approach the solution of the problems which are arising with old standards -- I think that this is now not only unwise, but also extremely dangerous. Precisely for this reason a new approach is necessary, a fresh view of many things in foreign policy. Here, I think the determination of approach to the issues of security gains central significance.

Security in the nuclear and space era -- this is actually recognized by all realistically thinking politicians, regardless of their political and ideological views. It is recognized by them all that security in our nuclear and space age can only be security for all. It is impossible to strengthen one's own security at the expense of the security of others.

[Kalyagin] And Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has even said that we are against damaging the security of the United States, that this is counter to our interests.

[Petrovskiy] Quite right, because this would only, so to say, worsen the overall situation, it would cause suspicion concerning actions. Finally, I think that the new mentality we are talking about has to presuppose real readiness; not readiness in words to put an end to the arms race and to strive for ridding the world of the danger of nuclear self-annihilation or any other self-annihilation. I think that today's philosophy of survival should be supplemented by actions. Now is a time when immediate action is required, action by all and everyone, in order not only for the new concept of security in the nuclear and space era to be asserted, but also in order that it be embodied in specific deeds.

[Kalyagin] Our new peace program is itself, in essence, a model of the new character of thinking of today's world. It opens up fresh horizons, new spheres of activity for mankind. Let us hope that the United States will take advantage of this unique, historic opportunity and go its half of the way to eliminate forever the nuclear threat hanging over mankind.

Here I think we will end our program. Thank you for taking part, and thanks to the viewers for their attention.

VELIKHOV EVALUATES CONSEQUENCES OF NUCLEAR WAR

PM301427 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Jan 86 p 14

[Article by Academician Ye. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "A Global Ecological Disaster" -- first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The book "The Night After..." ["Noch Posle..."] has been prepared by the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, a nongovernmental national organization set up in May 1983. It is headed by Academician Ye. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Commenting on the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee he said: "Today it is clear to everyone living on earth that we are at a critical stage in our history, when the question of whether we have a future is being decided. Whether mankind's history continues or whether it ends with us, depends on our generation. The point is that scientists and military experts are well aware that mankind and nuclear weapons cannot coexist permanently. Either -- or. There is no third way. Therefore, the constructive new proposals on the elimination of nuclear weapons put forward by the Soviet leader are a program for all mankind."

Today we offer for the attention of readers some reflections by scientists who took part in the preparation of this book ("Mir" Publishing House).

Ten or fifteen years ago, when people talked about nuclear war, it was noted that it would lead to the death of hundreds of millions of people and unprecedented devastation. Now it has become obvious that its consequences -- a global ecological disaster -- would mean the death of civilization. In effect it is a question of the continued existence of the human race and even of life on earth itself. That conclusion was formulated for the first time by scientists from various countries in early 1983 and it became known to the broad world public at the international conference on "The World After Nuclear War" held in Washington in October-November of that year. The scientists reached this conviction not only on the basis of their own scientific research, but also as a result of highly detailed, objective checking and comprehensive discussion of the possible consequences with colleagues at various international seminars, symposiums, and conferences.

The essence of the scientific warnings can be set forth in brief as follows. Nuclear explosions will cause mass conflagrations accompanied by the discharge into the atmosphere of a huge quantity of combustion products -- soot, ash, and toxic gases. Clouds consisting of tiny particles will absorb and disperse the sunlight, darkening the surface of the earth. The so-called nuclear night will set in; the radiation balance of the entire planet will be disrupted; and the temperature of its surface will fall in the course of a few days by approximately 30-50 degrees compared with the normal temperature for the time of year. As a result of the radical restructuring of the system of movement of air masses in the atmosphere, in a matter of a few weeks an unprecedented climatic catastrophe will spread over the entire planet, causing the mass destruction of flora and fauna.

Having acknowledged the correct, substantiated nature of the scientists' concern, it is necessary to take the next step -- to exclude the prospect of global climatic catastrophe associated with the first nuclear strike. Yet the United States has never renounced the possibility of being the first to use nuclear weapons, which is the pivot of all U.S. political and military doctrine. Soviet military doctrine does not include the concept of preemptive strikes, but is of a purely defensive nature.

The Soviet Union regards a nuclear attack as the gravest crime against mankind. The top Soviet leaders have noted repeatedly that counting on victory in a nuclear war is dangerous madness. Only someone who has decided to commit suicide could start such a war in the hope of emerging victorious.

In the past, in the first decades of the nuclear and space age, when international relations were dominated by the principle of military force, the concept of national security was associated with the quantitative accumulation and qualitative improvement of weapons. Of course, the arms race was regarded as an evil, but a necessary evil arising from existing international contradictions. However, today the continuation of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, not only exacerbates the situation in the world in general, but at the same time threatens various countries' national security. "The paradox of the nuclear age" is that the stockpiling and improvement of nuclear weapons constantly increases the danger: By virtue of a military-political miscalculation or adventurist militarist aspirations or simply because of some technical defect in sophisticated systems, these weapons could be used.

The scientists research which showed us the picture of the "nuclear winter" show to a still greater degree that the military force approach to the resolution of political problems is absolutely unacceptable. Modern weapons of mass destruction are weapons of collective suicide, not a "more effective means of conducting military operations." All countries and peoples must unite to resolve together the problem of the final renunciation of weapons of this type. Of course, this is a long and difficult path, but it is necessary to start moving in the right direction as soon as possible. This movement in itself will improve the international situation.

LOMEYKO PRAISES SOVIET DISARMAMENT STAND

PM301251 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Jan 86 p 14

[Vladimir Lomeyko "Political Commentary": "Toward a Nuclear-Free Civilization: Reflections on the Planet's Present and Future" -- uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Text] If you ponder on the nature and ways of implementing the 15-year program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons from our planet and listen carefully to the many-voiced echo of the planet itself, which is tired of its nuclear fetters, you can sense how truly the mood of the world has been caught. A CHANGE FOR THE BETTER IS NEEDED. And that means real, concrete measures to overcome the spirit of confrontation, clear away the heaps of nuclear weapons, banish the fear which is gnawing away at mankind, and restore people's shattered confidence. It is acknowledged everywhere -- frankly and openly, aloud and sincerely by most people, in an undertone by some, and against their will by others (but even that is a sign that things cannot be otherwise) -- that Moscow has expressed the product of long suffering, urgency, and desire, has expressed what torments and alarms everyone, regardless of ideology, race, or religion.

...I am reminded of a poster which I saw many years ago at a congress of the German Peace Union in Bochum, with Arnold Zweig's words: "Just as someone once started war, someone must start peace."

In order to start peace in our nuclear age, which has stopped believing in vows of peaceability and is corrupted by increasingly sophisticated methods of killing people, you need will and courage. And you also need the ability to rise above political and ideological contradictions and look beyond current disagreements in order to see new horizons, new shores of cooperation.

To do this, it is very important to rise above national egotism, tactical calculations, disputes, and dissensions, whose significance is negligible in comparison with the preservation of our main asset -- peace and a safe future.

All this has been not only proclaimed, but demonstrated in practice by the Soviet Union in its appeal to all peoples and governments to embark this very year, 1986, on ridding the earth of nuclear weapons in stages.

In a report from Geneva the U.S. television company CBS noted: "After hearing the details of the new Soviet proposal, one member of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks stated that in their totality they make a STUNNING IMPRESSION."

That assessment is understandable, because for many disarmament experts the Soviet statement sounded like a call for the start of a nuclear-free world. What is STUNNING is the very spirit, the very philosophy of a new way of looking at the world: not to compete to create new types of weapons of mass destruction, but to work toward their total elimination.

The proposed program is also STUNNING.

IN THE FIRST STAGE the Soviet Union and the United States stop all nuclear explosions, they halve the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory in the course of 5-8 years, and they renounce the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms. The Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone are also completely eliminated. The United States does not deliver its strategic missiles and medium-range missiles to other countries. Britain and France do not build up their respective nuclear arms.

IN THE SECOND STAGE the Soviet Union and the United States continue the reductions on which they agreed in the first stage and carry out further measures to eliminate their medium-range nuclear arms and freeze their tactical nuclear means.

The other nuclear powers freeze all their nuclear arms and do not have such arms on other countries' territories; they stop testing nuclear weapons. All the nuclear powers eliminate tactical nuclear weapons. Multilateral commitments are adopted on banning space strike arms and banning the creation of non-nuclear arms on new physical principles.

IN THE THIRD STAGE the elimination of all the remaining nuclear arms is completed. A universal accord is elaborated to ensure that these weapons are never revived.

It is precisely because this is a problem of significance to all mankind, that we can and must resolve only together, that the Soviet Union has submitted to the whole world a three-stage route for the ascent to the heights of a nuclear-free civilization. This matter is too important, too vitally important to all peoples, to be left to armchair experts. And people who try to see this as a propagandist ploy are only confirming their own inability to rise above the old, narrow way of thinking and their own self-interest.

Some people across the ocean were inclined to take offense: We, they say, were the first to call for the elimination of nuclear weapons. But you cannot erase the scar of the nuclear burn from history's memory: The United States was the first to make and the first to use nuclear weapons. And the Soviet Union raised the question of banning the production and use of nuclear weapons and the use of nuclear power for peaceful purposes for the good of all mankind as early as 1946.

But to this day we place the emphasis not on settling scores, but on acting together to eliminate the nuclear threat. That was why Moscow proclaimed a moratorium from 6 August through 31 December 1985 on all nuclear explosions. UNILATERALLY. And on 15 January this year, despite the fact that the United States has still not joined the moratorium, the Soviet Union decided to EXTEND FOR A FURTHER 3 MONTHS its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

That also belongs to the category of STUNNING facts for those who are in the grip of the old way of thinking in terms of strength and the desire for superiority. We had every moral right not to extend the moratorium. But we did so, placing the interests of all mankind above our own right, in the hope of trying one more time. Does this step not amount to a unilateral declaration of peace in the age of nuclear confrontation? Here the United States could cast aside ambition and tactical calculations and be the first of the nuclear powers to follow the Soviet Union's example. I do not think anyone's national interests would suffer in the slightest, and international security could only gain.

Is the impressive task put forward by the Soviet Union of completely eliminating nuclear weapons by the end of this century a realistic one? Yes, but only, of course, on the condition that there is an honest, mutual desire to do this. Thus G. Smith, former leader of the U.S. delegation to the SALT I talks, stated: "It should not be forgotten that the Soviet proposals come as a 'package' and the United States cannot select from that package only what it likes. The administration is clearly unwilling to agree to a number of the proposals, such as the nuclear test ban." U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger hastened to confirm this. He even "explained": Nuclear explosions are necessary for the modernization of U.S. nuclear arms. In the same way, the Pentagon chief is not about to renounce SDI; although not only the Soviet Union, but the vast majority of Western scientists believe that nuclear arms reduction is possible only if the Soviet Union and the United States both renounce the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms.

There is another side to SDI -- the international-legal and moral side. Space belongs to the whole human race in the dimensions of space and time. This means no one country has the right to take weapons into space without the consent of other countries, like a highwayman on the great Milky Way. Equally, no one administration has the moral right to clutter up distant space with weapons which will hang like the sword of Damocles above the heads of future generations whose voice cannot be heard today.

International observers stress that Moscow is displaying a new approach to the resolution of urgent global problems on a comprehensive basis. While placing the elimination of nuclear weapons in the forefront, at the same time the Soviet Union declares: The transfer of the arms race to space is impermissible; it is necessary this century also to eliminate chemical weapons and to ban the creation of non-nuclear arms based on new physical principles whose destructive capabilities approximate nuclear weapons. Our civilization must reject the philosophy of carnage.

The Soviet plan appeals to mankind's conscience. It proposes DISARMAMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT. That means, instead of guns, butter for the starving; instead of missiles, new forests and clean lakes for the weary.

Only mankind can free itself from the troubles hanging over it. Only people themselves, by comprehending the interrelationship of all peoples and all global problems, can find their own salvation. This faith in human intelligence and solidarity permeates the Soviet Union's entire approach to the resolution of the global problems of today.

People's common responsibility to present and future generations for the fate of the earth REQUIRES A NEW LEVEL OF THOUGHT appropriate to the rapid change in the nature of existence. Mankind's best minds dreamed of this and taught us about it.

"War and hatred add nothing to the joy of rapid joint progress," the French pilot and writer Antoine de Saint-Exupery wrote. "Why hate each other? We are all together, carried on the same planet; we are the crew of one ship. It is good when something new, something better is born in the dispute between different civilizations, but it is monstrous when they devour each other."

Thinking about M.S. Gorbachev's statement, I recall his speech to French parliamentarians on 3 October last year. I know from the reactions that it deeply touched not only the French, but many people throughout the world. The words spoken then displayed a sense of our common involvement in the development of human civilization and our common responsibility for the fate of future generations: "We are all keepers of the flame of life handed on to us by preceding generations."

"Each of them had its mission, and each in its own way enriched world civilization..."

"What of our generation? It has made great discoveries, but has also found the formula for the self-annihilation of the human race. On the threshold of the third millennium, we must burn the black book of nuclear 'alchemy.' May the 21st century be the first century of life without the fear of universal destruction."

"We will fulfill this mission if we pool our efforts. The Soviet Union is ready to make its contribution to ensuring a peaceful, free, and prosperous future for Europe and all the other continents."

True to the course proclaimed and deeming it necessary to change the dangerous course of events by force of example and common sense, the Soviet Union went to the Geneva meeting and there sought mutually acceptable accords. That was assessed highly in the world.

Let us not forget the sense of elation and pride in our country and in our leadership which all of us who were in Geneva in those November days felt after the meeting ended. Soon after M.S. Gorbachev's press conference in the Soviet mission, my Paris colleague Vadim Perflyev and I happened to bump into the correspondent of a major British newspaper in the city center. Anxious to share his impressions at once, he said: "I have just been talking to my father on the telephone. I cannot remember the old man being so excited for a long time. It seems he watched the entire press conference from your mission on television. It is rare for them to show it all, without cuts. And do you know what he said to me? Son, why have you been hiding Gorbachev from us? He talks business and talks in such a way that you believe him!"

More than once after that, I heard all kinds of people, West Europeans and Americans, acknowledge this: They are won over by the Soviet leader's sincere commitment to using every opportunity to prevent what cannot be rectified.

Calling on others to make joint efforts for the sake of peace and security, the Soviet Union demonstrates its will by force of its own example.

People are tired of phrasemongering about peace. They yearn to be able to trust words, words of action. Thinking about the world's reactions to the statement by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, you feel that for all the different words and intonations, they display a dominant mood: INSPIRATION.

That is the feeling aroused in all kinds of people on our planet by the concrete program proposed by Moscow for the elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

Let all earthmen greet the new century, the new millenium on a planet cleansed of nuclear pollution, beneath a peaceful sky and space! Is there a nobler, more alluring objective for our generation? Or an objective which places more responsibility on us in relations to our descendants, who must not become nuclear hostages through no fault of their own.

'CYNICISM, HYPOCRISY' CITED IN U.S. ARMS CONTROL

LD031800 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 3 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

While the White House proclaims in Washington that "the United States has been and remains in compliance with all treaty obligations and political commitments," U.S. Defence Assistant Secretary Richard Perle declares on the same day in Switzerland that under the "star wars" program the Pentagon intends to spread a "dome" of space strike arms over the territory of socialist countries, that is to violate deliberately the 1972 Soviet-U.S. treaty on ABM, and norms of international law.

The cynicism and hypocrisy of representatives of the U.S. Administration in interpreting provisions of international treaties on arms limitation and reduction assumed truly unprecedented scopes of late.

Unlike high officials of the White House, the self-same Perle, addressing an international conference of businessmen and politicians in Davos, did not even try to pretend that the United States observes its obligations under the 1972 treaty. The assistant of the Pentagon's chief, specifically, alleges that the United States has the right to break agreements on ABM since the Soviet Union has almost created an ABM "space shield" of its own.

Perle's crude falsifications in the sphere of the observance of international agreements clearly have a propaganda nature. They could be ignored if they did not pursue the aim of justifying a quite concrete sinister military program of the United States which American journalists call euphemistically "high risk space strategy."

The world now faces the choice: Either the infinite space remains peaceful or a practically irreversible process of its militarization with "domes" of strike arms will be started, with the "domes" which will surely appear not only over the territory of socialist countries.

The Soviet Union has pledged itself that it will not be the first to emplace strike arms in space. The USSR strictly adheres to its commitments under the termless ABM Treaty as a whole and in particulars. If the United States really complied with its treaty obligations, including those under the 1972 Treaty, the earth would be a safer place for humanity to live.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD312343 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 31 Jan 86

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" Program presented by Pavel Kasparov, All-Union foreign political commentator; Habib Mangal, Afghan ambassador to the USSR; correspondent Aleksandr Levchenko of the international department of All-Union Radio]

Situation in Afghanistan

[Excerpts] [Kasparov] The International Situation: Questions and Answers program is constantly receiving letters requesting us to talk about the situation in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the successes of that fraternal people in building a new life and in the struggle with the intrigues of imperialism. Today we asked Habib Mangal, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to the Soviet Union, to reply to listeners' questions. Today he is in our studio. So then, I have in front of me letters from our listeners.

Comrade Cherkasov, Panteleymon Alekseyevich, from the village of (Khatkovtsiy) in Vinnitsa Oblast and Ivan Filippovich Ivanov from Kiev request to be told what tasks are facing the Afghan people at the present time. I will now ask Comrade Mangal to answer this question. In our conversation with him we will be helped by Aleksandr Levchenko, correspondent of the International Department of All-Union Radio.

[Levchenko in Dari] Comrade ambassador, what sort of problems are the people of Afghanistan solving at the present time?

[Mangal in Dari with superimposed Russian translation by Levchenko] At present the people of Democratic Afghanistan, Comrade Mangal says, are working, if one can put it that way, in two directions. Firstly, they are repelling the attacks of the counter-revolution, regional reaction and international imperialism, and secondly, at the same time they are building a new society.

During the years since the revolution, the counterrevolution set up 140 centers for the training of dushmans on the territory of Pakistan. Thus, from 40,000 to 50,000 bandits are now gathered there. After a brief training in waging subversive actions with modern Western weapons, they are infiltrated into Afghanistan. Imperialism and primarily American imperialism, is not sparing dollars for the upkeep of the army of dushmans. According to the most modest calculations the United States and its allies have appropriated \$1.2 billion to the counterrevolution. That money has been used to pay for such crimes as the destruction of 130 mosques, 2,707 schools and 130 hospitals on the republic's territory. Altogether during the time of the undeclared war 36 billion afghanis worth of damage has been inflicted on Afghanistan.

However, the April Revolution is capable of defending itself. We are constantly devoting attention to the fighting efficiency of our Armed Forces. Out of every 2 afghanis in the country's budget we are forced to spend 1 afghani on defense.

The republic's Armed Forces, under the leadership of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA] have given, are giving and will give a resolute rebuff to the enemies. Last year alone in various regions of the country -- in Qandahar, Herat, Paktika -- large bandit formations were routed. The counterrevolution's attempt to turn the Panjsher Valley into one of its biggest support bases had failed. As a result of a successful military operation the bands which had entrenched themselves there were crushed. The Afghan People's Army is constantly perfecting its combat training. However, the united forces of imperialism are confronting us. Here, we speak with gratitude of the fraternal international aid of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan.

Our people will always be grateful to the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union for the fact that they are giving aid which the revolution is now so much in need of.

[Kasparov] Comrade Mangal, despite all burdens of the undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan which is being waged by the forces of imperialism and regional reaction, your country is even achieving considerable successes in peaceful construction. Gennadiy Sidorov, a listener from the settlement of (Koryachima) in Arkhangelsk Oblast, asks us in particular to tell him about this.

[Levchenko in Dari repeats the above question]

[Mangal in Dari with superimposed Russian translation] Despite the undeclared war the situation in the country is gradually returning to normal. To confirm this, let us turn to the facts. The republic is carrying through consistent reforms which are changing the old life style. The extraordinary meeting of the Revolutionary Council and the 16th PDPA Central Committee Plenum were major recent events. The party and the country's revolutionary government are making every effort to broaden democracy. I mean the participation by representatives of nonparty organizations in central government bodies, in the Revolutionary Council and in the Council of Ministers.

A great deal of attention is also being devoted to the start of a dialogue between the government and those groups of the population which so far still remain aloof from the revolutionary processes and even those who at first gave in to the dushmans' false propaganda. It can be said at the present moment that the process is taking place in Afghanistan of widening the public and political base of the revolution. Step by step the people are proceeding towards implementation of the tasks which it has set.

The country's foreign and domestic policy is gradually meeting with support and understanding abroad. To date the National Patriotic Movement unites in its ranks almost 800,000 people from different sections of the country's population and representatives of the Pashtun tribes. This is the first case in Afghanistan's history of the people actively taking part in the creation of a new society.

There are also other figures which today I cannot fail to mention with pride. During the 8 years that have passed since the revolution, the membership of the Democratic Youth Organization of Afghanistan has risen from 5,000 to 155,000. The growth in members of the Democratic Women's Organization of Afghanistan is also considerable: from 3,000 to 50,000. Over 350,000 people are taking an active part in the activities of the country's newly-created trade unions. Indeed we have something to be proud of. The growth in party membership is also the result of the working masses' trust in the party. To date the party has 145,000 members and candidate members within its ranks, whereas at the very start of its activity its membership did not even reach 20,000.

Among other major events which have taken place in Afghanistan of late was the Loya Jirga which took place in April 1985. Taking part in it were 1,800 people representing all sections of the country's population. They expressed support for the domestic and foreign policy of the PDPA and for the reforms which are being carried through in the country.

[Kasparov] Now I would like to pass on to the question of the state of the country's economy.

[Levchenko in Dari repeats the above question]

[Mangal in Dari with superimposed Russian translation] Despite the difficulties we have encountered in the economic sphere we can also be proud of certain successes there.

In 1984 the country's national income rose by 8.5 percent. Let us also note the growth of production forces; They increased by 1.5 times. The production of building materials, according to data for 1984, increased five fold, and the country's transport fleet by ten fold. The process of the expansion of the state sector in the economy is in progress. To date this is the strategic goal of the party and government in the economic sphere. At present already 60 percent of Afghanistan's industrial enterprises belong to the state. The state of affairs in agriculture is also on the whole quite good. The irrigation system has been fully put into operation. In the past 5 years the state invested almost 4 billion afghanis in its creation. Aid is being given to the peasants' cooperatives in the form of agricultural equipment and seeds and specialists are also being sent to them. The agrarian and water reform is also continuing. In the course of it over 300,000 peasants received land. Almost immediately after the victory of the April Revolution the state made the decision to free the peasants from paying debts to landowners to a colossal amount: 3 billion afghanis.

I have already touched upon the question of setting up cooperatives. Now I would like to say that right now over 500 of them have been set up in the country, and they unite 127,000 peasants. The Government of Afghanistan is constantly working toward improving the working people's housing conditions. During the 1984 to 1985 period alone over 300,000 square meters of housing were built for the working people. For comparison I will say that this is far more than during all prerevolutionary years in the country taken together. It is the policy of the PDPA to bring the country out of backwardness and ignorance and to turn it into a developed democratic state.

[Kasparov] We are speaking about the present-day of Democratic Afghanistan. But how do you see the republic's future? An answer to this question in particular is requested in his letter by Boris Alekseyevich Zhilkin, our permanent listener from the village of (Sredniy Raskhovets) in Kursk Oblast.

[Levchen in Dari repeats the above question]

[Mangal in Dari with superimposed Russian translation] I see the future of Afghanistan as bright and joyful. Our people are devoting all their strength to defending the gains of the April Revolution, which has shown the path to the future. Its aims are understandable for all ordinary people: A guarantee of freedom, happiness and the construction of a new flourishing life. Some people may say that all this will be achieved only in the very remote future. Just like many of my comrades, we are ready to devote all our strength, knowledge and experience in order to bring this closer. The attempts by imperialism and regional reaction to hamper the construction of Democratic Afghanistan will suffer inevitable failure. A guarantee of this is the solidarity with the Afghan people's struggle of the socialist countries and above all of the fraternal Soviet Union.

[Kasparov] Thank you, Comrade Mangal.

PRAVDA REVIEW OF WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

PM021845 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Nikolay Prozhogin "International Review"]

[Text] The week that ends today marked the conclusion of the first month of 1986. The New Year festival now seems long past.

The life of the peoples in the different countries has slipped into its usual rhythm with its daily preoccupations, joys and misfortunes, labor and struggle. The events that took place in the world last week were multifaceted and often contradictory. But whichever of these events make the front page, the main problems remaining at the focus of the international public's attention, if one is talking about the world as a whole, were those raised in CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement. Obviously, it is on their solution that the future of all mankind depends.

Collaboration and Cooperation

These problems occupied a prominent place in M.S. Gorbachev's Moscow conversations with Italian Communist Party (PCI) Secretary General A. Natta. The conversations confirmed the readiness of both parties to vigorously support the cessation of the arms race and non-militarization of space, the prevention of nuclear war and the total elimination of nuclear weapons, a general improvement in the international situation and development of cooperation between the USSR and Italy. There was confirmation of the CPSU's resolve to develop equitable, comradely relations with the PCI in the interests of peace and socialism.

In view of the complexity of the present-day international situation and the different historical development in our countries, there is nothing unnatural in the fact that the CPSU and the PCI differ in their assessment of particular problems, events, and facts. This makes fraternal dialogue between them, and with all communist parties, all the more valuable and necessary. The CPSU wants this dialogue to develop, taking on forms that correspond to the spirit and demands of the present day. It will help to overcome the problems, difficulties, and differences that exist in our movement on certain questions, which will contribute to further strengthening the communist's role in the struggle against the nuclear menace and for peace and socialism and the very difficult and responsible role that communists play in general.

The CPSU sees comradely cooperation between communists from different countries, free from all that is petty and alien, as an important element in collaboration among all left-wing, democratic, antiwar forces, of which they are an integral component. By coming together, these forces are capable of operating with much greater coordination than hitherto in the struggle against the war threat. It is no secret that on some questions, the differences between the various left-wing currents sometimes outweigh agreement. But no matter how deep their differences appear, they are far less important than the common task, the common desire to prevent nuclear war.

The conclusion is self-evident: We must not accumulate and cultivate differences; we must take note of them and seek a common denominator for collaboration and cooperation as the cardinal problem of the present day -- the elimination of the threat of nuclear war that confronts mankind.

Space Must Be Peaceful

The Soviet plan for the total elimination of nuclear weapons in a situation of the nonmilitarization of space has been carefully studied, analyzed, and commented on this past week. Essentially, the new Soviet proposals have begun to take on a life of their own. This confirms that they meet the demands of the times.

Of course, the Soviet Union does not expect the implementation of our initiatives to be a simple and straightforward affair. There are many confirmed and stubborn opponents of disarmament in the West.

These politicians express the interests of those monopoly-capital circles which see the further buildup of the pace of the arms race as a source of income and, at the same time, hope to turn it into an instrument for wearing socialism down economically and into a means of using military-power pressure against other unwelcome forces in the international arena. While neglecting their own countries' national interests and placing mankind's future on the line, they are bewitched by the fanciful dream of achieving world supremacy.

There is another real obstacle in the way of radical disarmament. It is the mental inertia apparent in the reluctance or inability of some politicians to recognize the cardinal changes taking place in the world. One of the changes that has created a new situation is the flooding of the world with nuclear armaments, which carries the seed of worldwide catastrophe.

The Soviet proposals are addressed primarily to the United States, as is known. President R. Reagan at first issued a statement welcoming them and promising that they would be carefully studied. But since then there has been a pause lasting more than 2 weeks.

The Western press, including the U.S. press explains this silence by saying that the Soviet proposals "took the Reagan administration by surprise" and caused disagreements to erupt again between the State Department and the Pentagon. In particular, this is the view of the author of an article in THE WASHINGTON POST. The Soviet proposals, he writes, "again revealed the profound difference of opinion in the administration on arms control questions" -- which, however, will "scarcely do as an excuse for the inability to prepare in good time a reply which would promote dialogue" in that sphere. "Shocking evidence of weakness" is how Democratic Senator W. Proxmire described the U.S. Administration's "equivocal and over general" reaction to the Soviet proposals.

The Washington administration's sluggishness is causing increasing concern among U.S. allies, with which the United States promised to discuss the Soviet proposals. "The delaying tactics being used by the administration," a correspondent for the British paper THE GUARDIAN reported from Washington, "is causing discontent...and, if they continue, could lead to the allies' expressing impatience."

It is clear from statements by senior Washington leaders and from numerous press articles that Washington's "hesitation" is probably chiefly due to the reluctance of certain circles to give up the pernicious "star wars" idea. "Critics of Reagan's policy on strategic issues," THE GUARDIAN correspondent writes, "will find little solace in the budget for 1987 which is to be presented to congress early next week. It envisages, in particular, a doubling of expenditure on the 'Strategic Defense Initiative,' which the Russians call the main obstacle to real progress at the Geneva talks."

Yes, the Soviet Union is a principled and implacable opponent of the "star wars" project. The Soviet position is dictated by the fact that universal, 100-percent space defense is impossible. Consequently, even if an actual "shield" really were created in space it would result in a further, unbridled arms race -- in not only nuclear but other arms, based on new physical principles. The widely publicized U.S. "space shields" project is at best an illusion both from the technical and from the economic and political viewpoints. But if a "space shield" were created, it could easily be turned into a "space sword."

The USSR does not intend to compete with the United States in the unsavory sphere of space militarization. But anyone who insists on this must be aware that our country would have the military and technical potential to redress the balance.

However, a space arms race could be too expensive -- impossible for both our countries and for mankind as a whole.

The Soviet Union's counter to the "star wars" plan is a "star peace" plan. It is addressed to the United States and to all the other states, and the proposal is the creation of an international organization for the peaceful exploration of space for the benefit of mankind as a whole.

Man's entry into space, which has taken place during the lifetime of our generation and which was an important intellectual achievement, is only the first step toward truly boundless horizons.

The disaster involving the U.S. Challenger space shuttle was a reminder of the difficulties and risks to human life posed by the exploration of space.

This tragic event has made Americans wonder about the "star wars" plan. THE NEW YORK TIMES writes that at least some congressmen will see the "Challenger incident" as evidence that the complex technology intended for SDI could also fail. The well-known observer J. Reston writes: "Washington figures belonging to both political parties have begun to realize that they are dealing with weapons which can blow up the world and which, even if they are treated with the utmost care, may not always be possible for them to control. This is the somber background to the tragedy which occurred in the sky above Florida." It "compels President Reagan to look again at the problem of space weapons."

But it looks as if the sober voices have again alarmed the advocates of "star wars" preparations. The U.S. press reports that certain "officials in the administration and in Congress have expressed the hope that the part of the space program planned by the Pentagon will not suffer as a result of the Challenger explosion." The President himself came to their aid. The day before yesterday he addressed the Conservative Political Action Conference and, although not mentioning his beloved SDI, his speech was clearly intended to encourage the "hawks" to reach "for the stars and beyond."

We will leave aside the rhetoric about "wholesome and enlightened conservatism," which is supposed to "illumine the whole world with the radiant beams of freedom." There is another interesting aspect to the President's speech -- the familiar "old-style" attacks on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and peoples struggling for their freedom. The heroes, according to Reagan are "the hope of Angola" -- imperialism's bloody puppet Savimbi -- and other dushmans of various nationalities. "Their hopes live in us, as do our hopes in them," the President passionately proclaimed. True, the list did not include the Haitian dictator and butcher Duvalier. This is understandable since on that day, according to contradictory statements by White House spokesmen, they were not sure whether the people of Haiti had not already ended the "life presidency" of this Washington stooge.

The fact that the U.S. President deemed it appropriate to include the relevant passages in his speech in the context of the Challenger disaster is particularly regrettable.

As for Soviet people, sharing the American people's sense of grief, they are convinced that the best memorial to those who perished in the Challenger disaster would be a more sensible approach to the realities of the present-day world, a resolute rejection of the plans to militarize space, and the adoption of a firm course of peaceful space exploration.

Disarmament for Development

The course pursued in international economic relations by the leading capitalist states in recent years has led to a sharp deterioration of the climate in this sphere. There are increasing crises in world economic ties as a result. A destabilization of trade, economic, foreign exchange, scientific, and technical relations among states is taking place. This course has a particularly pernicious effect on the developing countries' position. It blocks the process of improving international economic relations and restructuring them on a just a democratic basis. The economic security of states is jeopardized.

The line of the imperialist states -- first and foremost the United States -- of whipping up tension and looking for military, strong-arm solutions to international problems is obviously the main obstacle in the way of the normal development of the world economy and international economic cooperation. The cranking up of the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, and the plans for the militarization of space -- not to mention creating a threat to the maintenance of life itself on earth -- are doing enormous damage to mankind and diverting gigantic resources away from development needs.

Take, for instance, the unprecedentedly acute problem of the developing countries' foreign debt to the West. It is now nearing \$1 trillion only slightly ahead of the \$800 billion sum that the world annually spends on arms. And the already excessive interest payments are again going to enrich monopolies and finance the Western countries' budget deficits and military programs.

This occurs at a time when 400 million people living in the developing countries are systematically undernourished, 100 million children deprived of the opportunity to study.

The baneful effect of military spending is also obvious in examining the situation in the developed capitalist states. Take the United States, with its chronic unemployment disaster. According to U.S. labor union figures, \$1 billion in spending provides 58,000 jobs on military projects but could create 83,000 jobs in transportation or 84,000 in construction.

The list of similar facts and figures could be continued. We will restrict ourselves to just one more. There are explosives equivalent to 4,000 kg of TNT for every person on earth, while at the same time there is a per capita shortage of 300 kg of food.

All this runs glaringly counter to the demands of elementary reason, and it is time to put a stop to the state of affairs that has been created. This was clearly, accurately, and cogently stated in the USSR Government memorandum "The International Economic Security of States Is an Important Condition for Improving International Economic Relations."

The principle imposed by militarism -- arms instead of development -- must be turned upside down: disarmament for development.

MORE REPORTS ON SHUTTLE CHALLENGER DISASTER

Indian Press Comments Cited

OW031421 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1215 GMT 3 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Bronislav Myakota]

[Text] Search for debris of the spacecraft Challenger continues. The largest part found so far is the black forward section of the spacecraft. Specialists are interested most of all in the parts directly adjoining the carrier rockets. There are now indications that damage to the shell of the solid fuel booster may have caused the explosion. The cause of the tragedy could have been a malfunction of the device intended to separate the fuel tanks from the spacecraft in an emergency. An item which could prove to be the astronauts' cabin has been found at sea during the search.

Simultaneously with search operations, processing of almost 10 million bits of information coming from the Challenger during the 75 seconds of its tragic flight is now in progress. Data from computers and the 20,000 sensors mounted on the Challenger are being analyzed. A new version says that the astronauts literally needed several seconds to release one of the boosters that had started sparking to effect a forced landing.

The foreign press carries many commentaries in connection with the disaster at Cape Canaveral. Indian papers are devoting considerable attention to this topic. The Challenger disaster is a serious blow to supporters of the idea of reusable spacecraft which had already been described as a gold rush in space, says Bombay's DELHI [as heard]. It has shown once more that space exploration is not an exotic dream but a field intrusion linked to a wide range of unimaginable risks. Shuttle missions have been used for launching at least two U.S. military satellites, says another paper, the Calcutta TELEGRAPH. President Reagan must now realize the danger contained in his SDI. The Challenger disaster has taken several human lives. Failure [sboy] in the "star wars" system could bring down a nuclear winter on humanity. The Challenger tragedy will again intensify debate in the United States whether this multibillion program is needed, writes Madras's THE HINDU.

Sensors Removed Before Catastrophe

LD032101 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] The most likely cause of the Challenger shuttle spacecraft catastrophe is now believed by the mass information media, specialists and scientific observers in the United States to be a malfunction in one of the solid fuel booster rockets. U.S. television companies have shown video film from the National Aeronautics and Space Agency: One can see how, in the last 15 seconds of the Challenger's flight, a plume of flame appeared in the lower part of the body of the right booster rocket, just above the nozzle. AP news agency writes that apparently a crack in the body of the booster rocket or a burst of a welded seam led to flame pouring from the rocket and to the subsequent ignition of the ship's fuel tank.

The CBS television company reports that a number of experts are convinced that the catastrophe could have been prevented if the booster rocket had been equipped with a sufficient number of sensors, by which the astronauts, having observed that a crisis situation had arisen, could have separated the spaceship in time. However, as the press points out, a series of sensors was removed from the booster rocket in order to increase the ship's payload.

Space Programs to Continue

LD032052 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 3 TASS -- Despite the fact that the Challenger disaster has demonstrated to the world all the risks involved in the deployment of armament systems in outer space, the Pentagon is hurriedly seeking possibilities for speeding up work along the lines of military-related uses of space.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger has appointed David Latham, assistant secretary of defense for command, control and communications, to head a special group that will study the impact of the Challenger disaster on long-term military space programs, primarily, the "star wars" program. Pentagon spokesman R. Sims has said that the Department of Defense would do everything within its capabilities to carry through all military-related space programs that were worked out.

Commission To Study Explosion

LD040745 Moscow TASS in English 0719 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 4 TASS -- United States President Ronald Reagan has announced the establishment of a presidential commission of inquiry into the causes of the tragic disaster of the space shuttle Challenger.

Former Secretary of State William Rogers was appointed chairman, and astronaut Neil Armstrong deputy chairman of the commission.

CRITICISM OF VICE-PRESIDENT'S SPEECH CONTINUES

Speech Exposes Platform

PM031109 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Following the Same Course. Speech by G. Bush"]

[Text] Washington, 2 Feb -- Speaking at the Conservative Political Action Conference, U.S. Vice President G. Bush made it clear that the U.S. Administration does not intend to renounce its policy of state terrorism in the international arena and will continue its course aimed at spreading the arms race into space.

"I wish to assure you," G. Bush said, "that we will never give up the 'Strategic Defense Initiative' in arms control talks with the Soviet Union."

"Your cause is our cause," the vice president thus addressed Savimbi, head of the anti-Angolan bands and protege of the CIA and the Republic of South Africa, who was the "guest of honor" at the Conservative conference. These same words, as follows from G. Bush's speech, are fully applied by the administration to the Afghan dushmans and former Somoza followers, through whose hands the United States is waging an undeclared war against Nicaragua.

The vice president's speech was basically an exposition of the political platform with which Reagan's Republic Party is preparing to approach the interim elections to congress and local organs of government in November this year.

Why did the White House deem it necessary to deliver such a speech when America is gripped in mourning, honoring the memory of the seven astronauts who tragically perished as a result of the catastrophe with the spaceship Challenger? The answer is obvious: "The White House clearly does not like the sentiments that have appeared in the United States since the Challenger tragedy. This tragedy, M. McGrory, correspondent for THE WASHINGTON POST, points out, has once again strongly emphasized the exceptional danger of the course aimed at militarizing space.

Bush Supports SDI

OW040243 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1215 GMT 3 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by B. Myakota]

[Text] U.S. Vice President Bush spoke at the Conservative Political Action Conference in Washington. He let it be known that the U.S. Administration has no intention of giving up its policy of state terrorism in the international arena and will continue the course of spreading the arms race in space. Bush said, I assure you that we will never agree to give up SDI at the arms control talks with the Soviet Union. The vice president praised this initiative, which is fraught with universal catastrophe, as one of the gigantic steps forward made in the 20th century. The vice president also listed the massive U.S. rearmament program, which has already swelled to almost \$2 trillion, as one of the greatest achievements of the current administration.

Savimbi, leader of anti-Angolan gangs and henchman of the CIA and South Africa, was an honorary guest at the conference. Bush called him and other bandits conducting armed struggles against legal foreign governments as freedom fighters. Bush told Savimbi, your cause is our cause. Bush's words fully apply to Afghan dushmans and former Somozists through whose hands the United States conducts an undeclared war against Nicaragua. The administration is ready to provide them with hundreds of millions of dollars in line with its doctrine of so-called neoglobalism.

The vice president's speech was actually a formulation of the political platform of Reagan's Republican Party for the mid-term Congressional and local government elections in November this year. Why did the White House deem it necessary to have such a speech at a time when the United States is in mourning, honoring the memory of the seven astronauts who tragically died in the spacecraft Challenger catastrophe. The answer is obvious. The White House is clearly concerned about the mood that has emerged in the United States after the Challenger tragedy. WASHINGTON POST observer McGrory says that it has once again, with special vigor, pointed out the exclusive danger of the course of militarizing space taken by the Washington administration. One of the oldest and most authoritative observers in the United States, Reston, says the Americans have begun to realize that they are dealing with a weapon that might blow up the entire world and over which, despite all the efforts and endeavors, they have no control.

CONGRESS' ATTITUDE TO PEACE INITIATIVES VIEWED

LD202349 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Jan 86

[Political observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] As has already been reported, the USSR Supreme Soviet has appealed to the U.S. Congress in connection with the new peace initiatives set out in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

The role of the U.S. Congress in the structure of the upper echelons of power in the United States is of no little importance. Suffice to recall that both chambers in Congress confirm the U.S. federal budget which specifically provides for appropriations, including the major ones, for all kinds of military programs from the production and testing of nuclear weapons to the development [razrabotka] of space weapons. Nevertheless, quite a few voices have been heard and are being heard both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, pointing out the danger and ruinous nature of the arms race -- particularly if it is to be transferred to space too.

The Supreme Soviet has now appealed to the U.S. Congress with a call to select in the end the only reasonable alternative: To put up a lasting barrier to the arms race both on earth and in space. The USSR has for the first time in the history of the nuclear age put forward a detailed and specific program that has a precisely calculated period -- for the coming is years -- for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons everywhere. The supreme legislative body of our country is also suggesting to the U.S. parliament that a joint movement toward this aim be begun immediately.

What should be done first of all? We think that the cessation of nuclear testing would be the first practical step. As far as I know, this point of view is also held by a number of U.S. congressmen. Incidentally, many of them in this respect are taking into account the upcoming elections to Congress in the fall where the chances of the candidates will to a considerable extent depend on their attitude to the demand for a halt to nuclear explosions that has become widespread in the country.

As you know, our country has unilaterally extended the moratorium on all nuclear explosions for another 3 months. The Supreme Soviet is calling upon the United States to follow our example and not to block any further the implementation of a most significant task for the whole of mankind. We will hope that the U.S. congressmen too will raise their voices to put an end to the madness of the nuclear race.

PRAVDA DISCLAIMS SOVIET ROLE IN PDYR EVENTS

PM301708 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed "Rejoinder": "Mythmongers at Work"]

[Text] B. Kalb, an official representative of the U.S. State Department recently communicated a sensational piece of "news" to journalists. "There are," he declared, "certain indications of direct Soviet participation (in the events in South Yemen -- [PRAVDA] editor's note) such as, for instance, reports by refugees in Djibouti that Russians are helping adjust the insurgents' fire and are also unloading ammunition." So why was it deemed necessary to put up this latest, crudely fabricated anti-Soviet canard?

The myth of "the hand of Moscow" is a favorite method of Western politicians and propagandists which everyone finds well and truly tedious. Of late it has been especially fashionable, above all among U.S. officials, and even those of exalted rank, to detect "the hand of Moscow" in conflicts that are flaring up in the so-called "Third World." And this is, of course, not fortuitous: there is an acute need for a propaganda cover for the "new globalism" doctrine proclaimed by Washington. Its essence is that the United States, it transpires, has a right to, and must, intervene in the internal affairs of all countries where it has "vital interests" and these, if one heeds the words of U.S. politicians, are everywhere. In the same interview, Kalb confirmed that this also applies to South Yemen.

Hence the United States' reaction to the recent upheavals in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen [PDRY]. Immediately after the tragic events in Aden of 13 January, the majority of news organs throughout the world noted the internal nature of what was taking place there and noted the clear-cut position of the Soviet Union which called for an end to the armed clashes and the reconciliation of the sides, and resolutely opposed any outside interference in the affairs of South Yemen. Only certain press organs, obviously acting in line with a set scenario, tried, as the saying has it, "to cloud the issue," to distort the Soviet Union's stance, and ascribe to it support for one of the sides. But this story patently had no foundation: it was too much at variance with the facts.

In these conditions, B. Kalb decided to "resuscitate" the fabrication about "the hand of Moscow," alluding to the fairytales of certain refugees which were known to him alone. True, Kalb immediately added, in order that he could not be exposed as a liar: "we cannot confirm these reports." However, the Voice of America broadcast them over the airwaves unreservedly. And it even added, on the same Kalb's say-so, that PDRY Prime Minister H. al-'Attas, who has now been elected acting president, was no more and no less than "Moscow's placeman" -- and this merely because at the time of the events of 13 January when he happened to be out of the country, he was in Moscow on his way home.

It is legitimate to ask: what is it that people want to conceal behind this double falsification? Probably it is to divert attention away from aggressive actions against Nicaragua, or away from military provocations and blackmail against Libya? Or to divert attention from the buildup of the U.S. fleet's activity in the Indian Ocean? Or, most likely, all three of these.

But propaganda tricks are capable neither of blackening the Soviet Union nor of whitewashing U.S. interventionist policy. After all, facts are stubborn things.

MORE COMMENTARY ON SAVIMBI'S WASHINGTON VISIT

PRAVDA's Gan

PMO31353 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Article by Vitaliy Gan: "The Real Cause of the Sensation. Our Commentary"]

[Text] In Washington recently there has been no let up in the beating of propagandist drums, with which negotiations held here with J. Savimbi, head of the anti-Angolan terrorist group UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] have been accompanied. The bandit in the pay of Pretorian racists never dreamed of such a splendid reception as the one arranged for him by the U.S. Administration. The doors of the highest Washington establishments were hospitably thrown open to Savimbi. He was taken in the embrace of U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, Secretary of Defense Weinberger, Vice President Bush, and, finally, the master of the White House, who was not ashamed to call the UNITA leader, "the hope of Angola in the struggle for freedom."

The matter was by no means limited to a noisy show surrounding the cutthroat's stay in the American capital. Although the specific results of his talks are being kept secret, there is only one opinion as to what it is all about. Having thrown off any pretence, the administration has unequivocally declared its intention of rendering military and economic assistance to Savimbi and his helpers, who are trying to overthrow the legitimate Angolan Government. What is more, it is reported that representatives of the White House and Congress are now discussing the possibility of allocating the terrorists approximately \$54 million for the acquisition of United States weapons. According to the press, the only "snag" lies in the choice of methods for carrying out deliveries.

This, however, does not alter the essence and meaning of what is happening. Publicly taking side of this antigovernment, terrorist group, the U.S. Administration has given clear evidence that it is stepping up its policy of fanning regional conflicts and shamelessly interfering in the affairs of countries which have chosen an independent course of development. In other words, Savimbi's visit was an original demonstration of the practical application of the newly hatched "doctrine of neoglobalism," the basic postulate of which, to quote the newspaper THE BALTIMORE SUN, is support for "freedom fighters" (detachments of terrorists, counterrevolution, and international reaction are thus hypocritically referred to here) throughout the world.

Moreover, to all appearances, those on the Potomac are seriously considering direct U.S. military operations if the struggle against any inconvenient government using the UNITA bands, for example, the Nicaraguan "Contras," or the Afghan dushmans is not crowned with success. Consequently, it is hardly accidental that the newspaper close to the administration, THE WASHINGTON TIMES, writes that "the story with Grenada must become the rule."

There is also another very important aspect. "Neoglobalism" is the poisoned fruit of ultraright-wing U.S. forces, which strive to interpret all international problems as a manifestation of "Soviet-U.S. confrontation." This is done, of course, not without design and is calculated to foil any steps taken to normalize relations between the USSR and the United States and to prevent progress being made along the path of solving the key problem of the contemporary period -- curbing the arms race.

The position taken by the administration in relation to Angola convincingly attests that Washington is prepared to unhesitatingly use methods of state terrorism, in order to force its will on those who refuse to follow its "instructions." However, it is also obvious that American claims to total license, to global diktat, and brigandage are at variance with the spirit of the time and are a challenge to the international public.

Reshetnikov

LD020030 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 1 Feb 86

[Yuriy Reshetnikov commentary]

[Text] The red carpet treatment accorded this week in Washington to Angolan insurgent leader, Jonas Savimbi, provides the basis for a commentary by our observer, Yuriy Reshetnikov. This is what he writes:

On his visit to Washington, Jonas Savimbi, the leader of an Angolan puppet group, UNITA, received a welcome usually reserved for top government officials. In addition to that, he has received President Reagan's personal pledge of U.S. support. Although the contents of the talks with the U.S. chief executive haven't been disclosed, it seems this support will not be limited to merely moral and political encouragement. Obviously this wouldn't be enough to sustain an all-out insurgency movement, which Washington has in mind. According to Western observers, the UNITA leader asked for and was promised United States military assistance. Last year after Congress repealed a 1976 ban on U.S. aid to UNITA, the administration promptly set about gathering support for a military aid program which would help the beleaguered UNITA terrorists. It seems the administration has opted for covert aid which initially would involve up to \$15 million to provide an array of weapons, from anti-aircraft missiles to land-mines, to combat the Angolan Government.

The United States, however, is not to be the only supplier of the puppet group. In his struggle against Angola, UNITA gunmen rely heavily on military aid from South Africa. (?Thus, in a) constructive engagement with the Pretoria regime Washington hopes to settle one regional conflict in southern Africa.

Along similar lines, the United States plans to resolve another regional conflict, (?such is) located thousands of miles away from the African continent, the one in Nicaragua. This conflict, which has endured entirely through United States efforts, is likely to receive a new dimension shortly. President Reagan is expected to request \$100 million this year for contra gunmen in Nicaragua, thus culminating his efforts to bring down the legitimate government in that country.

In 1984 Congress briefly withheld U.S. covert aid to the Nicaraguan terrorists, known as contras, but last year \$27 million in so-called nonlethal aid was again authorized. By nearly all accounts, for all the U.S. aid the contras have made a poor showing militarily and are said to be on the point of total collapse. Since the CIA organized them in 1981 they have received more than \$100 million in U.S. funds, but their days appear to be numbered unless Washington (?does) something about it. However, even the massive military aid, as envisaged by the U.S. Administration, is unlikely to expedite Washington's aims in Nicaragua; the overthrow of the Sandinist government and installation of a docile regime. As U.S. congressman Jim Leach realistically observed, United States military aid to the contras can only buy more violence. He said there was going to be more chaos, more death, more uncertainty [words indistinct] some point in time we're going to have to return to the precept of looking at negotiated settlements. The latter course of action so far is not contemplated by the administration. As in the case of Angola, the way to resolve the conflict in Nicaragua appears to be violence.

COMMENTATORS VIEW U.S. POLICY TOWARD CONTRAS

Expanded Aid Planned

LD291417 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 29 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reporting

During the talks with ringleaders of the bands of Nicaraguan counter-revolutionaries here U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz approved their program for removing the present government in Managua from power and replacing it with a pro-American regime. Sanctioning the escalation of terror and violence against the Nicaraguan people, Shultz maintained, according to a UPI news agency report, that plans drafted by the "contras" "represent a program for democratic reform in Nicaragua."

This is not the first time when the U.S. Administration is trying to cover up the U.S. policy of state terrorism toward Nicaragua with statements about some kind of "striving for democracy". The hypocrisy of such pronouncements becomes obvious if one recalls the atrocious crimes committed by CIA-trained and supervised bands of "contras" on Nicaraguan soil. More than 12,000 people were killed, 5,000 wounded and the same number abducted -- such is the list of victims of Washington's policy of banditry pursued on an international scale. U.S. hirelings destroyed 321 school buildings, 50 health centers and razed entire villages.

THE WASHINGTON POST admits that the U.S. Administration is about to begin a new round of a campaign to get the U.S. Congress expand aid to the armed bands of counter-revolutionaries. After the meeting with George Shultz, Arturo Cruz, one of the "contras" ringleaders, told reporters that, according to his estimates, the White House intended to request up to 130 million dollars for that purpose. "Things look a lot better than they did before to obtain the necessary support which we need," said Adolfo Calero, another ringleader of the counter-revolutionaries.

'Provisional Government' Plan Approved

LD301807 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 30 TASS -- TASS commentator Sergey Kudryavskiy writes:

The U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz at a meeting in Washington with Nicaraguan counter-revolutionary leaders approved their plan of forming "a provisional government" in Nicaragua.

The approval of the plan signifies gross interference into internal affairs of the sovereign Sandinist republic. The government of which was elected by the people in the course of general elections. Shultz' meeting with contra leaders shows the hypocrisy of the American Administration which in word declares support for the Contadora Group's efforts aimed at having a peace settlement of the situation in Central America, but in deed it thwarts all attempts of bringing peace to the region.

The U.S. Administration planned such a step, formation of a "provisional government", long ago. Practically since the very first days the Sandinist government came to power the United States repeatedly made attempts to destabilise its activities. When those attempts failed, the United States resorted to an undeclared war against the sovereign republic by supplying up-to-date American weapons to former Somoza guardsmen. The White House ordered Nicaragua's blockade in order to undermine its economic development. It was on the Washington administration's initiative that American-Nicaraguan negotiations, held to settle the situation in Central America, were foiled in Manzanillo (Mexico).

Washington, which grants huge aid to contras, calls it "humane". "Humanists" from Washington close their eyes to CIA mercenaries' killing defenceless civilians, burning schools, hospitals, cooperatives, exploding economic structures.

The approval of the contras plan shows that Washington stops at nothing to have the regime in Central America, unsuitable to it, overthrown.

CIA Report Termed 'Fabrication'

LD032104 Moscow TASS in English 2033 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 3 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutyy reports:

The CIA came out with another sordid falsehood, asserting brazenly that it is the Sandinist authorities, and not "contras" terrorist gangs armed by the USA, that perpetrate violence and terror in Nicaragua.

It was issued after the recent publication of a report by prominent American Jurist R. Brodie, the report that greatly annoyed the White House.

The report, on the basis of the testimonies of 145 Nicaraguan and American citizens, creates a horrible picture of brutalities and slaying of peaceful Nicaraguan people by former members of Somoza's army trained by the CIA's "instructors".

Professional misinformers from Langley have immediately been given an assignment to draw up their own "report" so as to "refute" the testimonies presented by Brodie. They could not come up with facts, so they resorted to blatant lies and allegations. If the authors of the falsehood are to be believed, anti-Nicaraguan terrorists do not kidnap representatives of local government bodies, teachers and peasants, which was reported even by the U.S. press more than once. They assert that reports about the use by bandits of mortars and other heavy arms against peaceful Nicaraguans are not in keeping with reality, that reports that "contras" torture and kill prisoners are absolutely wrong.

Meanwhile, none other than former ringleader of one of the biggest terroristic gangs of "contras" Edmundo Chamorro said outright that his gang had been forcibly recruiting new fighters and also torturing and killing prisoners.

The CIA's "report" is so crude that it evoked indignation even of some U.S. Congressmen. According to Congressman Sam Gejdenson, it is at best a crude affair, at worst a deliberately false one.

It should be noted also that the shoddy anti-Nicaraguan fabrication appeared precisely at a time when, as the press notes, the administration intends to seek a sharp increase of the aid to "contras".

GROMYKO RECEIVES VANCE, DISCUSSES RELATIONS

LD031732 Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 3 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, today received in the Kremlin Cyrus Vance, a noted American public figure and politician, a former U.S. secretary of state. Vance is paying a visit to the Soviet Union in connection with the sittings of the working group on Soviet-American relations of the Dartmouth Conference.

Exchanging opinions, the sides touched upon various aspects of the present-day international situation and Soviet-American relations.

Andrey Gromyko drew the visitor's attention to the Soviet programme for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons, formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement of January 15. If the USA agrees to the Soviet proposals, their implementation could rid mankind forever of the nuclear threat, to prevent the spread of the arms race into outer space and to strengthen trust among countries and peoples.

It was stressed by the Soviet side that the ending of nuclear weapons tests could become the first and efficient step towards restricting the arms race. The Soviet Union halted testing unilaterally way back last August and appealed to the USA and the other nuclear powers to follow its example. At the outset of this year the Soviet state, again unilaterally, extended its moratorium till March 31. People all over the world are expecting the USA to give a positive response to the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union. Nuclear testing must be resolutely prohibited from the point of view of both the security of the peoples and human morality.

The USSR Supreme Soviet supported the latest peace initiatives and explained them in an address to the U.S. Congress, Vance was told. It is necessary to do everything possible to achieve substantial and effective decisions leading to the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons, and parliaments can contribute to the formulation of such decisions. Their words carry much weight in foreign politics as well. The international public, including the Dartmouth Conference, which continues constructively to contribute to a discussion of international politics, is playing a positive role in promoting practical results on the problem of preventing an arms race in outer space, terminating it on Earth, and of the reduction and eventual complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

This means that if we speak of prospects for the development of mankind the common political denominator for actions of all countries on the international scene -- and this is a firmly held opinion of the Soviet leadership -- should be disarmament, and above all, nuclear disarmament.

The Soviet program for the elimination of nuclear weapons given the ban on space strike arms fully accords with these lofty goals with the subject of the current Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Geneva and the results of the Geneva summit meeting between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

The Soviet peace initiatives, Andrey Gromyko stressed, have been met with approval by the governments of many countries and by broad masses. They strike the imagination both with their determination and scale. A positive reaction abroad, including from famous statesmen in western countries, testifies that these initiatives should be reckoned with.

The nations of the world expect the American leadership to show political will along the lines of constructive cooperation on these problems of paramount importance. The administration in Washington has more than once declared its allegiance to the idea of eliminating nuclear weapons. And now the Soviet Union gives it a chance to engage in that process in actual fact, not merely in words. We live in an age when the leaders of states, should, must take decisions that would prevent a nuclear holocaust.

Both sides expressed the conviction that the negotiations on the limitation and elimination of nuclear arms, and on the prevention of the spread of the arms race to outer space could be a success if both powers -- the U.S.S.R. and the United States -- worked consistently toward the said goal. This is confirmed by the experience that was accumulated by the Soviet Union and the United States of America in the course of previous negotiations which ended in the conclusion of relevant agreements between the two.

Cyrus Vance spoke with appreciation of the new Soviet peace initiative and noted that it had impressed him favorably. He came out in favor of an early search for accords along the road to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and said that from his point of view the U.S. Administration should come up with a detailed point-by-point reply with a view to opening concrete and business-like negotiations.

Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada under the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., took part in the conversation.

U.S. INTEREST IN PHILIPPINES' ELECTIONS EXAMINED

LD300041 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2008 GMT 29 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] I have before me a report by the well-known U.S. journalist Gelb, written, the author says, on the basis of conversations with high-ranking representatives of the White House, the State Department, the Pentagon, and the intelligence agencies. This is what the report says:

The Reagan administration, Gelb writes, has formed the unanimous opinion that the departure of President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines from his post is essential to U.S. interests. Nevertheless, the administration, that is, the U.S. Government, has decided not to remove Marcos from power either by clandestine means or by open attacks on him, as yet. This question is still being discussed in the White House. Nobody in Washington will ever think to ask the question: By precisely what right? Who has given Washington politicians the power to decide the fate of the head of a sovereign foreign state? And if his fate is being decided in Washington, of all places, why all the elections and referendums which the West so grandly calls the true expression of the will of the people?

Washington has decided not to remove Marcos as yet. After all, they are still discussing the question of what to do about the resulting scandal; and should he be physically removed? They are also selecting candidates for government posts and presidential posts in some other countries. To them, everything is permissible: they can pardon whomever they please, and execute whomever they please.

But to continue: Having decided not to remove Marcos just yet, Washington could not refrain from crude meddling in the election campaign in the Philippines. In particular, it was decided to send a special group of observers led by Senator Richard Lugar, to, as it were, follow the progress of the election and monitor the observance of democratic norms during it. It would be interesting to know whether the Filipinos send their observers to the United States to monitor the progress of elections there.

A difficult task faces us, Lugar complained. Our delegation comprises only 40 observers, and there are 49,000 polling stations in the Philippines. How can they all be covered? Does the senator want to send 49,000 observers from America -- one for each polling station?

I shall not dwell in detail on the causes of this state of nerves among Washington politicians. The causes are well-known. Very important U.S. military bases are situated in the Philippines, and in the U.S. capital there is extreme concern about their future. It is reported that the Pentagon has even drafted secret plans to transfer U.S. naval and air force units from the Philippines to Guam, or Okinawa, or other Pacific islands, if a new head of state of the Philippines, elected in the forthcoming election, demands the withdrawal of U.S. military bases. And this cannot be ruled out, if one takes account of the fact that the Filipino people have long been demanding this.

This afternoon we received a report that a group of Filipino political figures, led by one of President Marco's advisers, has demanded the expulsion from the country of the U.S. ambassador for his unceremonious interference in the country's internal affairs.

TRUD REPORTS ON TRADE UNION TALKS WITH JAPANESE

PM301232 Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Jan 86 p 3

[Unattributed report: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev yesterday received a delegation from the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (Sohyo) and the Federation of Independent Unions of Japan (Churitsu Roren), which is in the Soviet Union to participate in the latest session of the Soviet-Japanese Trade Union Standing Commission.

The talk that was held summed up the results of cooperation between the two countries' trade unions in 1985 and discussed questions of the further development of Soviet-Japanese trade union ties and their role in strengthening peace and friendship between the Soviet and Japanese peoples. During the talk and during the commission's work it was noted that cooperation among the three kindred organizations is developing successfully. In particular, the sides expressed satisfaction at the results of the 15th mass Soviet-Japanese trade union meeting "for peace and friendship between the Soviet and Japanese peoples" held in Hiroshima in November 1985.

The representatives of the working people's organizations of the Soviet Union and Japan stressed that maintaining and strengthening peace is the ardent desire of working people of the entire world and an important and inalienable prerequisite for ensuring and defending their interests, improving their living and working conditions, and developing the trade union movement. The talk and the commission session stressed the important positive role of the Soviet-U.S. summit held in Geneva in November 1985. The representatives of the two countries' trade unions stated their desire to promote in every possible way the incipient process of normalizing the international situation.

The desire to step up joint actions by working people and trade unions to prevent nuclear war, end the arms race, and achieve the total prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons was reaffirmed. It was noted that the 15 January 1986 proposals of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which are aimed at doing just that, have met with the support of all the world's peoples. The AUCCTU, Sohyo, and Churitsu Roren representatives noted that the prevention of the militarization of space is of decisive importance for reaching agreements on radical nuclear arms reductions. They resolutely opposed the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative."

During a friendly exchange of opinions the sides stated their desire to actively participate in the movement to develop genuinely good-neighborly relations between the USSR and Japan, relations which are of great importance for the cause of peace and security in Asia and worldwide. The same day a protocol was signed which defined specific avenues and forms of cooperation between the two countries' trade unions for 1986.

COMMENTARY VIEWS U.S.-JAPAN JOINT MILITARY ACTION

OW301211 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Kondratyev commentary; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The Japanese press reports that during routine consultations in Honolulu on security issues, the representatives of the Pentagon and the Japanese Self Defense Agency agreed to outline a joint battle plan in case of an armed conflict in Asia. Our commentary:

[Kondratyev] Hello comrades. It is no secret to anyone that previous U.S.-Japan military doctrine provides for joint action under so-called extraordinary circumstances. Judging from everything, the military agencies of both countries are ready to go even further. It now concerns Japanese Self-Defense Forces being taken outside the boundaries of the archipelago. If Washington starts a war somewhere in the region, then Tokyo will be automatically obliged to take part in it. This is the result of increased military obligations between the allies. Such a concession to Pentagon demands, says the newspaper ASAHI, directly contradicts the Japanese constitution which forbids the use of force or threat of force in solving international disputes. Striving to tie Japan as closely as possible to its Pacific Ocean basin strategy, the Pentagon keeps referring to the worn-out claim of a Soviet military threat, and attributes plans for blocking access to the Sea of Okhotsk to our country. The purpose of this propaganda is obvious. U.S. military circles fear the possible improvement of relations between the Land of the Rising Sun and the Soviet Union. Many in Japan note that the organizers of the Honolulu meeting clearly tried to counteract Comrade Shevardnadze's talks with Japanese leaders where both sides spoke in favor of developing dialogue in the interests of both countries and on the basis of mutual benefit, equality, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. The new steps being undertaken by the militarist forces of the United States and Japan are fraught with danger. The newspaper MAINICHI thinks that strengthening the military alliance with the United States may bring many dire consequences to the country and this is the reason why there is growing criticism in Japan of the shortsighted policy of the Tokyo hawks who having forgotten the lessons of the last war latch on ever more actively to their Pentagon colleagues' plans.

JAPAN SOCIALIST PARTY OFFICIAL ON TIES WITH U.S.

OW301319 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1145 GMT 29 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Dmitry Biryukov]

[Text] The Japanese Socialist Party has declared that it is resolutely opposed to plans for the militarization of space. Submitting a request to the Japanese Government at a session of the Diet, party chairman Matayoshi Ishibashi said that the U.S. star wars program is very dangerous to the cause of peace insofar it means transferring the arms race to space. Ishibashi demanded that the Nakasone government refuse to cooperate with the United States in its plans for the militarization of space. I would like to say that the protest movement against strengthening military ties with the United States is growing stronger in Japan these days. Representatives of the Japanese peace committee, the All-Japan Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, and other mass antiwar organizations have come to the island of Okinawa where two-thirds of the U.S. military bases in Japan are located.

The point is that Tokyo and Washington are now discussing the possible extension of the law giving U.S. military authorities the right to confiscate any land on Okinawa for another 20 years. A powerful public movement, calling for not renewing the law and returning lands that have been taken away from Okinawa inhabitants has grown on the island. Bright signboards have been put up along roads on the small island of Miyake, approximately 200 kms south of Tokyo. "Our Island is Not for Military Bases" and "We Say No," are the main themes of the posters. The point is that one of the leaders of the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party intends to go to the island to convince the inhabitants of Miyake to accept a new U.S. naval air station. The island inhabitants are indignant at the plans. Eighty-five percent have already signed a protest. By the way, the islanders have been deceived. It turns out that the funds promised for the repair of damage caused by the 1983 volcano eruption will be used for the construction of a military airfield.

MURAKHOVSKIY VISIT TO MONGOLIA REPORTED

LD311801 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 31 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The 30th meeting of the Soviet-Mongolian intergovernmental commission on economic, scientific, and technological cooperation was held in Ulaanbaatar 27-31 January. The Soviet delegation was headed by Comrade Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Mongolian delegation by Ragchaa, member of the Politburo of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers. The commission considered a number of specific questions relating to the prospects for an increase in the efficiency of economic, scientific, technological, and trade cooperation between the USSR and Mongolia.

The leader of the Soviet delegation was received by Comrades Batmonh and Sodnom.

SHEVARDNADZE VISIT TO JAPAN EXAMINED

OW011726 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 31 Jan 86

[Vladimir Tsvetov commentary]

[Text] At its regular meeting on Thursday, 30 January, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee approved the results of the negotiations in Tokyo by Mr Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo and Soviet foreign minister. In this connection, Soviet television and radio political commentator Vladimir Tsevtov writes:

There is no doubt that the results of the Soviet foreign minister's negotiations with Japanese Foreign Minister Abe and Prime Minister Nakasone will have positive effects on the development of Soviet-Japanese relations. The two countries agreed to continue their resumed political dialogue in the future. Both the Soviet and Japanese sides became more acquainted with each other's views regarding a very wide range of international questions and bilateral issues. The Soviet and Japanese foreign ministers signed agreements on trade, economic, and financial activities and extended the term of documents exchanged on cultural interchanges. The two sides agreed to vitalize scientific and technological cooperation.

I accompanied Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze as a correspondent on his visit to Japan. I was also in Tokyo when a foreign ministers meeting was held there 10 years ago between the two countries. I think that the recent meeting was held in a friendlier atmosphere and that this friendly atmosphere had a favorable effect on the outcome of the negotiations to some extent.

At the recent meeting, the Japanese side seemed markedly eager to reach mutual understanding on the issues discussed, compared with the previous meeting. I think that this change in the Japanese side's attitude in the negotiations is the result of an influence which the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva had on the whole international situation, accordingly, on Soviet-Japanese relations as well.

In the past 10 years, the Soviet Union has spared no effort to develop and consolidate political, economic, and cultural exchanges with Japan. However, it is hard to say that the Japanese side has always been responsive to these Soviet efforts. However, while in Tokyo on the recent visit, I heard Japanese reporters say that Japan has now begun to quicken its pace to keep abreast of the swift pace of the times in the wake of the Geneva summit.

Especially, Japan's business circles are now showing deep interest in expanding economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. The USSR-Japan and Japan-USSR Business Cooperation Committees are scheduled to meet this April, and a mammoth delegation made up of about 400 businessmen will visit Moscow. However, we are convinced that the future of Soviet-Japanese relations should not be limited to the expansion of trade or cultural cooperation.

The Soviet Union and Japan, two neighboring countries, can make a very great contribution to consolidating peace and true security in Asia. The Soviet Union views the recent Tokyo meeting as a step toward this end. Now that the Soviet Union has proposed a realistic plan to abolish nuclear arms by the end of this century, the Soviet Union and Japan have far greater opportunities to make joint endeavors for detente in Asia.

During Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's visit to Japan, CPSU Central Secretary Gorbachev disclosed a plan to abolish nuclear arms in his 15 January statement. A wide strata of people, politicians, and mass media in Japan expressed support for the Soviet nuclear abolition plan in unison. A Soviet decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions of all kinds by 3 months evoked a particularly broad response. It is understandable that, as a country that suffered from nuclear weapons for the first time in history, Japan has shown interest in the new Soviet peace plan. The complete abolition of nuclear arms has now become a real possibility. The Soviet plan truly has a universal nature, and in this sense it of course includes the Far Eastern region.

In this connection, it should be noted that in their report on the Tokyo meeting, mass media turned their particular attention to Soviet SS-22 missiles deployed in the Far East. We can make the following explanations on these SS-22's. The Soviet Union and the United States maintain near equilibrium in strategic arms. However, in addition to its strategic arms, the United States has been equipping its forward bases in Asia and its aircraft carriers patrolling waters near Soviet borders with various nuclear weapons. This has upset the balance, causing the United States to have an advantage. This is a widely known fact. That is, these nuclear weapons include the ship-launched Tomahawk cruise missile, the F-16 fighter-bomber which has been deployed at U.S. air base at Misawa and is capable of mounting nuclear attacks, and various nuclear weapons deployed in the ROK.

Under these circumstances, the Soviet Union cannot help deploying missiles in the eastern region. If the United States reduces its nuclear weapons which have compelled the Soviet Union to deploy these missiles, the Soviet Union will make the same amount of cutback on its SS-20's. By the way, Japan, whose high government officials have often expressed their concern about Soviet missiles, can advise the United States to take measures so that the Soviet Union can reduce its SS-20's.

In conclusion, I would like to add that one of the positive results of the Tokyo meeting is that neither of the two sides suffered a loss through negotiations. I say this particularly because a Japanese paper carried a list of marks showing which side scored what point. However, the meeting has revealed a sign of progress in the relations of the two countries on the basis of equality and reciprocity. Therefore, I can say that both sides benefitted from the negotiations.

MPRP POLITBURO ASSESSES SHEVARDNADZE VISIT

PM311315 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In the MPRP Central Committee Politburo"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 29 Jan -- According to MONTSAME reports, the MPRP Central Committee Politburo totally approved the results of conversations held by J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Great Hural Presidium, and talks held by M. Dugersuren, Mongolian minister of foreign affairs, with E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, during his official friendly visit to Mongolia.

The MPRP Central Committee Politburo expressed heartfelt gratitude to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, for his message addressed to J. Batmonh. The MPRP Central Committee Politburo emphasized that these conversations and talks were a vivid manifestation of the close interaction of the two parties and countries and a specific confirmation of their mutual determination to tirelessly develop and strengthen the friendship and cooperation between Mongolia and the USSR for the benefit of our two peoples and for the sake of the cause of peace, socialism, and communism.

U.S. MILITARY DEPLOYMENT IN ROK CRITICIZED

SK300551 Moscow International Service in Korean 0930 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] As is known, the U.S. special combat forces, which are said to have been formed to [word indistinct] terrorist acts, virtually serve Washington as a means to implement the policy of taking the stand of strength.

As far as the special combat forces deployed in Korea are concerned, they are moved and employed at any place in Asia and the Pacific to defend the notorious vital (?interests) of the United States. It is not accidental that the U.S. special combat forces have appeared in the southern half of Korea. Their appearance [word indistinct] the maneuvers of the Pentagon strategists to create a constant source, which disturbs stability in the independent Asian countries and threaten their security, in the Far East. The constant prevalence of tension on the Korean peninsula and the maintenance of the South Korean regime, the outcome of the cold war policy, comply with the global hegemonic interests of the United States.

As a result of Washington's efforts, the Korean peninsula has, actually, become one of the powder kegs in Asia. There, some 40 U.S. military bases exist and over 40,000 U.S. soldiers are deployed. In addition, some 1,000 nuclear weapons are stockpiled in South Korea. Their destructive power is 720 times stronger than the U.S. atomic bomb dropped in Hiroshima in 1945.

In accordance with a decision of the security consultative council between the United States and the Seoul regime last year, the Air Force capabilities of the United States in South Korea have been augmented by 72 modern F-16 fighter-bombers, A-10 bombers, [words indistinct], Cobra helicopters, and Black Hawk helicopters.

Beside nuclear weapons, the Pentagon's plan for the new-type nuclear weapons at frontal bases cannot but arouse apprehension from the Asian peace-loving social circles. According to reports by world publications, the United States is studying the possibility of deploying neutron bombs and Pershing-II medium-range missiles in South Korea.

Also, the fact that Washington has consumed more funds to militarize the Seoul regime every year stimulates alertness. In 1984, \$230 million in the form of loans were offered to Seoul. Last year, however, military aid, \$10 million more than that of 1984, was provided. The military spending of the Chon Tu-hwan regime has increased geometrically. This year, a military budget which was 13 percent more than the amount spent in augmenting the armed forces last year, was approved. The fund will be spent, above all, in purchasing offensive weapons and combat equipment from the United States.

In light of these facts, it is not difficult to understand what purpose Seoul's propaganda on a so-called threat of southward invasion seeks. The purpose is to hide the dangerous war preparations of the United States and the Seoul regime in the southern half of Korea. Such a line of war poses a threat to peace and security in the Asian and the Pacific countries. The war preparations of Washington and Seoul present a striking contrast to the DPRK's peace-loving policy aimed at the normalization of the situation on the Korean peninsula.

As noted in recent talks between Comrade Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea and DPRK president, and Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet foreign minister, the Soviet Union invariably supports the DPRK's proposals and [words indistinct] for [words indistinct], making the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone, and achieving the peaceful and democratic reunification of the country. Not war preparations, but peace conforms to the basic interests of the Korean people.

COMMENTARY CRITICIZES UPCOMING 'TEAM SPIRIT-86' EXERCISE

OW010810 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 31 Jan 86

[Sergey Ruslanov commentary]

[Excerpts] Dear listeners, according to an announcement made in Seoul, "Team Spirit-86", a U.S.-South Korea joint military exercise is scheduled to begin in South Korea on 10 February. Moscow Radio commentator Sergey Ruslanov writes the following about this exercise:

Seoul and Washington officials claim that "Team Spirit-86" is aimed at fostering combat sustainability for defensive purposes in time of emergency, but this claim can no longer fool anybody. The word -- emergency -- needless to say, refers to a nonexistent threat from the north. Clearly, that contention is a sheer lie.

The north -- namely the DPRK -- has time and time again called upon the South Korean and U.S. Governments to refrain from a show of force which may aggravate tension not only on the Korean peninsula but also in all of the Pacific region. The DPRK has been calling for the removal of nuclear weapons from and the dismantling of military bases in South Korea and the conversion of the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

The recent DPRK proposals reflect anew Democratic Korea's principled line on building confidence on the Korean peninsula. The DPRK, deciding to suspend large-scale military exercises beginning 1 February this year, has called on South Korea to follow suit. In addition, it has proposed that no military exercises be carried out as long as north-south talks are under way. We do not have to explain how important and timely these proposals of the DPRK are. They mark another step forward for the socialist countries in their quest for improvements in the Asian-Pacific situation.

As you know, last summer the Soviet Union advocated the concept of a comprehensive approach to the Asian security issue. This concept also forms the starting point for the numerous overtures made by such socialist countries as the MPR, Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea concerning Asian security. All this shows that voices demanding peace are strongly reverberating in steadily expanding areas. Reflected in these voices are apprehensions entertained by various Asian nations about threats to peace in this part of the world. These threats to the peace originate in the aggressive policy of the U.S. imperialists.

The Japan-U.S.-South Korea military alliance being concocted by the United States in the Pacific poses a direct threat to peace and security in the neighboring countries. The foundations for this military alliance have been laid by the Pentagon, of the U.S. DEFENSE Department. There are respective bilateral security pacts between the United States and Japan, and concluding a similar treaty between Japan and South Korea is regarded as an immediate task. Many steps have already been taken toward this goal under U.S. pressure. First of all, Japan and South Korea recently agreed to exchange visits between their warships and, a U.S. Air Force unit in the southern part of South Korea and a Japanese Air Force unit is scheduled to carry out a joint exercise in the near future. This suffices to show where U.S. intentions lie. In brief, a Japan-U.S.-South Korea triple military alliance is gradually shaping up as a reality.

"Team Spirit-86", the upcoming U.S.-South Korea joint military exercise, will mark a new step toward this military alliance and is directed at undermining the process of normalization in the situation in the Korean peninsula and the unification process of North and South Korea.

It is because of this that the peace proposals of various socialist countries in Asia are assuming increasing urgency today. These proposals reflect the wishes of all those people in the Asian-Pacific region who oppose the U.S. imperialist machinations to convert the Asian region into an arena of military confrontation and who are demanding that this region be made into a zone of peace and genuine good neighborliness.

KORNIYENKO, DELEGATION VISIT IRAN; MEET KHAMENE'I

Talks With Velayati

LD031426 Tehran IRNA in English 1410 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Tehran, Feb. 3, IRNA -- The first deputy foreign minister of the Soviet Union, Georgiy Korniyenko, in a meeting with Foreign Affairs Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati, here Monday, handed over a message from his Soviet counterpart, Eduard A. Shevardnadze, invited Velayati to visit Moscow.

Korniyenko who arrived here Sunday heading a delegation, hoped that the visit would take place this year. Velayati accepting the invitation added that he will pay an official visit to Moscow in an appropriate time.

Foreign Minister Velayati and Korniyenko held extensive talks on issues of mutual interests. During the meeting (?heads) of the joint economic commission were appointed and it was decided that the commission be held at ministerial level in a near future.

Meets With Musavi

LD031744 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian 1630 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Korniyenko met Majlis Speaker Hashemi-Rafsanjani this afternoon. During the meeting Mr Korniyenko conveyed written messages from the presidents of the two Soviet chambers to Hashemi-Rafsanjani in which the importance of the expansion of relations and exchange of parliamentary delegations was stressed.

During the meeting, the Soviet deputy foreign minister also stressed the further expansion of relations between the two neighboring countries in various fields, on the basis of goodneighborly relations, mutual respect, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. Then Hashemi-Rafsanjani thanked him for the messages from the presidents of the two Soviet chambers. He stressed the importance of establishing goodneighborly relations.

The Soviet deputy foreign minister today presented a message from the chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers to Mir Hoseyn Musavi, our country's prime minister. The Soviet deputy foreign minister, in the course of presenting this message, informed Mr Musavi about the desire of his country's officials to expand relations with the Islamic Republic of Iran and to consult on international and regional issues, and also presented a report on the efforts he has made in this connection. Prime Minister Musavi then thanked the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers for his message and explained the policies of the Islamic Republic of Iran based on goodneighborly relations with neighboring countries and described the criteria for expanding ties between the two countries.

Khamene'i Receives Korniyenko

LD041024 Tehran IRNA in English 1015 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] Tehran, Feb. 4, IRNA -- President 'Ali Khamene'i received here Tuesday morning the visiting first deputy foreign minister of the Soviet Union, Georgiy Korniyenko.

During the meeting the Soviet official handed over a message from the Soviet President Andrey Gromyko to President Khamene'i.

He also conveyed warm greeting of the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev to President Khamene'i. During the meeting the two sides discussed expansion and strengthening of bilateral ties and good neighbourly relations.

Agree To Set Up Commission

LD041129 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian 1030 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] President Seyyed 'Ali Khamene'i recieved this morning USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Georgiy Korniyenko. In this meeting, at which Mr Besharati, our country's deputy foreign minister, and the two countries' ambassadors were also present, Mr Korniyenko expressed delight at visiting the Islamic Republic of Iran, conveyed warm greetings from Mr Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and submitted a written friendly message from Mr Andrey Gromyko, president of the USSR, to our country's president. In reply, Mr Khamene'i expressed gratitude for the messages of the CPSU General Secretary and the president of the USSR.

Also during this meeting the expansion and strengthening of bilateral relations and good-neighborliness between the two neighboring countries were stressed.

The Central News Unit correspondent reports that our country's deputy foreign minister, Mr Besharati, described the talks between the Soviet deputy foreign minister and our country's officials as good and successful. He said: During their meetings various issues of mutual interest were discussed and views were exchanged. During these talks it was also agreed to set up a joint commission led by the two countries' economic and financial ministers. It was also agreed to establish the Tehran-Moscow air route by the Aeroflot company. He added: on economic issues also the two sides agreed to continue talks in order to improve relations.

'Frank, Constructive' Talks

LD041046 Tehran IRNA in English 1023 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] Tehran, Feb. 4, IRNA -- The first deputy foreign minister of the Soviet Union, Georgiy Korniyenko, left Tehran this morning at the end of a three-day visit an talks with President 'Ali Khamene'i and other Iranian officials.

Korniyenko who led a political delegation to Tehran, described his talks with Iranian officials as "frank, comprehensive and constructive".

He was seen off at Tehran's Mehrabad International Airport by acting Foreign Affairs Minister 'Ali Mohammad Besharati.

PRAVDA CITES TASS ON U.S. 'HOSTILE ATTACK' ON DRA

PM031121 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Hostile Attack"]

[Text] Washington, 2 Feb -- President Reagan has announced here that the DRA is being deprived of its most favored nation status in trade with the United States. This means, in particular, a sharp increase in customs duties on any Afghan goods entering the United States.

As the Associated Press Agency notes, at present the volume of Afghan-American trade is minimal. It is obvious that the adopted decision can only be regarded as yet another hostile attack on Afghanistan and its people.

BELOSHAPKO ON WASHINGTON SEMINAR ON AFGHANISTAN

LD311513 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 31 Jan 86

[Vladimir Beloshapko commentary]

[Text] At the initiative of the Federation for U.S.-Afghan Actions, a special seminar has been held in Washington on the problems of Afghanistan. Our commentary -- at the microphone is Vladimir Beloshapko.

Comrades, don't be misled by the title Federation for U.S.-Afghan Actions. It has nothing to do with efforts by the United States and Afghanistan to normalize their relations. The leader of the Federation, (Nicky Andrew Iveagh), a former officer in the U.S. special-purpose forces, is a supporter of something quite different. You see, he does not like the present scale of Washington's aid to the Afghan counterrevolution. According to (Iveagh), \$470 million -- and this is precisely the sum which the dushmans are to receive during the current year -- is quite insufficient. To the applause of his audience, representing the ultra-reactionary U.S. organization at the seminar, this ex-subversive demanded that supplies to the terrorists of the latest U.S. arms and ammunition be sharply raised.

"We must create a direct air-bridge to Afghanistan," (Iveagh) stated. This is how, without a hint of embarrassment, essentially unconcealed armed interference in the affairs of a sovereign state that is thousands of miles away from the shores of America is being planned today in Washington.

Statements hostile to Afghanistan and anti-Afghan gatherings are commonplace in the United States, and the aforementioned seminar could be overlooked, especially since the organizations participating in it are private. But the point is that the plans for the expansion of the undeclared war against Afghanistan which were heard at the seminar correspond precisely to the recommendations contained in the research on Afghanistan which was recently prepared by the Heritage Foundation organization.

Its authors also expatiated on an air bridge, that the dushmans need anti-aircraft installations, antitank weapons and other latest armaments. The Heritage Foundation maintains the closest ties with the present U.S. Administration. The White House listens to its opinion very attentively. So, the seminar in Washington and the research of this organization could quite easily be links in one chain, reflecting the anti-Afghan mood which predominates in the ruling circles of the United States. This is politics, the politics of state terrorism.

FATHERLAND FRONT CHAIRMAN PRESENTS PLENUM REPORT

LD031907 Kabul Domestic Service in Pashto 1530 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Excerpt] The Seventh National Fatherland Front [NFF] Central Council Plenum, chaired by Abdorrahim Hatef, NFF Central Council chairman, met yesterday at the front's hall to discuss matters related to the 10 theses of Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and president of the DRA Revolutionary Council, and the realization of the decisions of the 16th PDPA Central Committee Plenum.

Taking part at the plenum work were: Solayman La'eq, candidate member of the PDPA Central Committee Politburo and the minister of tribal and nationalities affairs; some members of the DRA Revolutionary Council and the Council of Ministers; some responsible officials of the PDPA Central Committee departments; heads of NFF central and provincial councils; some secretaries of the party and provincial committees; provincial governors and heads of the executive councils of the people's representatives; and a number of responsible officials of the country's social organizations.

A number of front organizational questions were discussed. Twenty-seven members of the NFF Central Council were elected and 14 members of the executive board and of the executive board presidium were elected.

The plenum report was read by Abdorrahim Hatef. Among other things he stated: The 16th PDPA Central Committee Plenum emphasized that the new approach is directed not only toward revolutionary elements and organizations, but demands the consolidation of contact and cooperation with forces whose stand remains hostile.

Another part of the report states that the basic desire is that our social organizations should become sufficiently popular and thus have the necessary influence on conditions. So far the mechanism of mutual relations of these organizations within the framework of the NFF have not been sufficiently specified. The NFF should acquire the capability of rallying around it those strata and groups of people who, because of various religious, social and national reasons, are outside the revolutionary process or are against it. Specific proposals have been prepared aimed at enhancing the efficiency of the NFF in relation to its links with social member organizations, establishments, and interested state organs, and have been passed to relevant sources. In order to completely realize this goal, it is necessary to organize the broad attraction of all society's strata, classes and individual elements. Correct and speedy measures should be taken to form the front's councils in those districts, subdistricts, villages and hamlets in accordance with the previously envisaged plan. A door for exchanging letters, for tribal assemblies and contacts should be opened with those individuals who are left outside the revolutionary process or are opposed to this process.

The PDPA Central Committee plenum emphasized that sufficient work (?for unity) among the Pashtun and Baluch border tribal communities should be strengthened: Therefore active and strong links should be established with tribal assemblies. In order to broaden and consolidate the social bases of revolutionary rule, the aims and aspirations of the revolution should be further explained. Broad work should be pursued in studying and explaining the 10 theses of Babrak Karmal, the 21 November DRA Revolutionary Council statement and the resolutions of the 16th PDPA Central Committee Plenum.

TASS INTERVIEWS NEW REVOLUTIONARY COUNCIL MEMBER

LD031608 Moscow TASS in English 1536 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Kabul, February 3 TASS -- TASS correspondents German Baykov and Boris Shabayev report:

In today's Democratic Afghanistan nobody encroaches upon the rights of my people, its culture and traditions. Moreover we get considerable aid from the state, a TASS correspondent was told by Sayyed Mansur Kayhani, one of the new members of the DRA Revolutionary Council, head of the sect of Ismailites, representing a considerable group of Afghanistan's population.

Afghanistan, S.M. Kayhani continued, is a developing country. Therefore, the noble aims of the April Revolution are close and understandable to us. Yet counterrevolutionary gangs directed by the enemies of the Afghan peoples are trying to prevent their implementation. Using the slogan of "Defence of Islam" as a cover, the hirelings of American imperialism and its Pakistani puppets plunder and destroy our houses, schools and mosques, kill true patriots of Afghanistan.

But we can tell the truth from the lies, and therefore, we have taken up arms to defend our land, to assist our people's state as much as we can. The bandits will never again dare to appear in our area.

Now, S.M. Kayhani went on to note, that the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan led by Babrak Karmal have adopted historical decisions on a broadening of the social base of the revolution and urged everybody, to whom our homeland Afghanistan is dear, to make their contribution to ensuring its peaceful and prosperous future. I, in common with many other patriots, have realized that I belong to the ranks of the fighters for the ideals of the April Revolution. Now that I have been elected member of the Revolutionary Council I continue serving the cause of our people and its benefit. I am sure that the people will duly appraise the work we do.

Touching upon the Western propaganda fabrications about "violations of human rights" in Afghanistan, he said: "The Afghan people enjoys now such freedoms, about which it could not even dream in the past. Judge for yourself: Was it thinkable in prerevolutionary Afghanistan that representatives of all sections of the population, all tribes and nationalities would take part in the administration of the state, that any Afghan, who has no ties of relationship among the powers that be or a substantial capital could take an important post? Today everybody enjoys equal rights, equal opportunities, provided he or she has enough knowledge and experience. That is why those to whom the people entrusted important posts enjoy the respect of the people. I have a large family. Nobody encroaches upon our family life, upon the traditional life styles of my people, and its religion. That is why the Western "well wishers" would be well advised to take up the question of the observance of human rights in their own countries. They have nothing to do in Afghanistan".

The chief of the sect of Ismailites stressed that Soviet-Afghan friendship has deep-going historical roots and the enemies will never be able to undermine it. The Afghans will always be sincerely grateful to the Soviet Union for the inestimable aid which Afghanistan has invariably received at the crucial junctures of its history.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA ON NEW DRA JURISTS' ASSOCIATION

PM291515 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jan 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Developing Democracy"]

[Text] Kabul, 28 Jan -- The major sociopolitical events being held in the DRA this year are aimed at further democratizing the country's political life and expanding the revolutionary authority's social base, BAKHTAR notes. The creation of the DRA Jurists Association, Solidarity, and Friendship Organization and is a collective member of the National Fatherland Front, also accords with these important tasks at the present stage of the national democratic revolution.

The new association, the agency stresses, is intended to contribute to the development of democracy in the country, the strengthening of revolutionary legality, the improvement of the masses' legal education, the raising of jurists' professional standards, and the improvement of the judicial and legislative organs' activity.

On the international level the new organization will participate actively in the peoples' anti-imperialist struggle for world peace, in defense of human rights, and for freedom, democracy, and progress.

MUSLIMS' STATEMENT IN DEFENSE OF PASHTUN TRIBES

GF030726 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 2 Feb 86

[Statement issued by Soviet Muslims "In defense of the struggle of the Pashtun tribes who are fighting for their freedom" — read by announcer]

[Text] In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate. The Muslims of the Soviet Union are following with interest the oppressive action by the officials of Pakistan against the Muslim Shinwari and Afridi Pashtun tribes living the Khyber valley. Pakistani officials who claim to feel so sorry for the Muslims of neighboring Afghanistan are now dropping bombs every day on the Shinwari and Afridi tribes, destroying their homes and their mosques, killing women, elderly people, and children on charges that they have raised their voices in defense of their own rights and because they are against the transit of armed bandits to Afghanistan through their territory. This has transformed their ancestral land into a base of imperialism and reactionaries against the brotherly people of Afghanistan.

We realize with deepest sorrow that hundreds of Pashtun tribesmen are forced to leave their homes to seek shelter with their religious brothers and relatives in Afghanistan. The leaders of this country respect Muslims. We now call upon all Muslims in all countries and all those who are fighting for justice and for human rights to raise their voices in defense and support of the valiant struggles of the Pashtun tribes for victory of their principles of freedom.

[Signed] On behalf of the Muslims of the Soviet Union: Mufti Babakhnov, responsible for the clergy of the Muslims in Central Asia and Kazakhstan; Mufti Tajeddinnoy, chief of the clergy in the European sector of the USSR and Siberia; Sheykh-ol Islam Pashazadeh, chief of the clergy of the Muslims of Georgia; and Mufti (Hekiyov) chief of the clergy of the Muslims of northern Georgia.

JARUZELSKI CITED ON SIGNIFICANCE OF CPSU CONGRESS

PMO31331 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Among the Fraternal Parties": "PZPR Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Warsaw, 1 Feb -- A routine PZPR Central Committee plenum has opened here. In the opening address, W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish State Council, noted that the approaching 27th CPSU Congress will be an event of tremendous significance for the entire international working movement and for the progressive and peace-loving forces of the world. The speaker stated that the PZPR delegation's participation in the work of the Soviet Communists' supreme forum will help to strengthen ties between the two parties and increase friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Polish peoples.

A report on the tasks of improving and developing the educational system in Poland was delivered by T. Porebski, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee. He pointed out that illiteracy has been completely eliminated in Poland during the years of people's power. Around 1.5 million people have received higher education. Some 8.2 million children and adults or over 20 percent of the population are now studying in the country. The state's general line in the education and training sphere is to prepare the younger generation for active participation in building socialism and to mold a socialist world outlook and scientific views of the world around us. Education should help to shape patriotic and international stances and a sense of responsibility for the country's development.

The speaker indicated the need for a consistent improvement of social sciences teaching in Poland's higher educational institutions and for the enhancement of the role of Marxism-Leninism in the training of specialists. Questions of further developing the educational system in Poland, T. Porebski said, will be extensively discussed in the period of preparation for the 10th PZPR Congress.

CSSR TRADE ENVOY HOLDS PRESS BRIEFING IN MOSCOW

LD302223 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1730 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Report by Stefan Simak, permanent Moscow correspondent]

[Text] Frantisek Mares, head of the Czechoslovak trade representation and ministerial counsellor, discussed the issues of the Czechoslovak-Soviet trade contacts at a press conference in Moscow today. Present at the press conference was also Stefan Simak, our permanent Moscow correspondent:

Last year Czechoslovakia and the USSR exchanged goods valued at R55 billion, while, in the second half of the eighties, the volume of mutual deliveries will increase by at least 18 billion. Frantisek Mares said at the Moscow press conference today that the dynamic development of our economic relations contributed towards strengthening the economic potential and efficiency of the two economies.

Close cooperation with the USSR helped Czechoslovakia overcome the negative consequences of the worsened international situation, as well as some internal problems of economic development. Linking with the traditional forms, the cooperation will develop on qualitatively new levels in the future.

In the engineering technology sphere, which, apart from new materials, constitutes the focus of the exchange, the volume of numerically controlled machinery, machine tool centers, robots and manipulators will increase.

From the very beginning of the 8th 5-Year Plan, the work on the joint construction of the gas pipeline Progress from Yamburg, the ore-enrichment combine at Krivoy Rog and the Urals gas complex in western Kazakhstan will be fully under way. The Czechoslovak representative expressed the conviction that the new agreements on economic and scientific-technological cooperation create sufficient scope for seeking further non-traditional forms and methods in the sphere of mutual trade exchange.

HUNGARIAN, ARGENTINE MINISTERS HOLD BUDAPEST TALKS

LD032147 Moscow TASS in English 2026 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Budapest, February 3 TASS -- Hungary and Argentina will continue to do everything possible to strengthen world peace and to promote disarmament and cooperation, Peter Varkonyi, minister of foreign affairs of Hungary, and Dante Mario Caputo, minister of foreign affairs and religion of Argentina, stressed during their talks here today. The Argentine foreign minister is paying an official visit to Hungary.

In the course of the talks, which passed in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual understanding, the sides informed each other of the foreign policy actions of their countries and exchanged opinions on outstanding issues of world politics. They paid special importance to questions of detente and disarmament, to peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, to the development of cooperation, to the broadening of opportunities for dialogue and also to the peaceful settlement of the crisis situation in Central America.

The sides also considered the condition of state-to-state contacts and opportunities for the development of cooperation between the two countries.

The sides stated that Hungary and Argentina had similar or identical views of all the major international issues. It was stressed that at present there was no alternative to the policy of peaceful coexistence. The foreign ministers of the two countries spoke highly of the peace proposals of the Soviet Union, put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement. Touching upon ways to settle the crisis in Central America, the sides pointed out that Hungary and Argentina stood for a fair settlement of that crisis. The only possible way to achieve it is through negotiations.

Discussing the condition of Hungarian-Argentine ties, the sides said that there still existed untapped opportunities for their strengthening and development. It was noted that both countries were seeking to develop cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.

Dante Mario Caputo also had talks with Hungary's Foreign Trade Minister Peter Veress. The sides voiced their mutual desire for broader economic, scientific and technological cooperation between Hungary and Argentina.

FRANCE EXPELS 4 SOVIET DIPLOMATS, USSR PROTESTS

Reportedly GRU Members

LD031539 Paris Domestic Service in French 1500 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] We have just learned that four Soviet diplomats have just been expelled from French territory. The diplomats left the capital on a regular Aeroflot flight at the end of last week. Paris made this decision after the D.S.T. [Direction de la Surveillance du Territoire] arrested in Rennes a retired French noncommissioned officer, Bernard Souriceau, who was seen wandering suspiciously rather too close to the Ile Longue base where our nuclear submarines are stationed. The four Soviet diplomats in question, who have been declared persona non grata, are four intelligence officers in the GRU, the Red Army intelligence service. In 1983, 47 Soviet diplomats were expelled following a decision made by Francois Mitterrand. Moscow is probably getting ready to expel four or five officials working in Moscow in retaliation.

'Resolute Protest' to France

LD040928 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0907 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 4 Feb (TASS) -- At the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 1 February [date as received] a resolute protest was stated to the Embassy of France in Moscow in connection with the unfriendly action undertaken by the French powers in relation to the four Soviet employees in Paris, against whom were put forward groundless accusations of "impermissible activity."

Such actions by the French side are not in accordance with its statement about its aspiration for supporting and developing good relations [dobryye otnosheniya] with the USSR. The responsibility for the consequences of this action rest on the French authorities.

It was noted that the attention of the French Embassy has already been drawn more than once to the fact that a number of French employees in Moscow are not observing the rules of behavior for foreign representatives in the USSR, and are engaged in impermissible activity. In this connection it has been suggested to certain French Embassy staff that they leave the USSR.

PRAVDA CITES MARCHAIS ON PCF ELECTION PLATFORM

PM031446 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Election Platform"]

[Text] Paris, 31 Jan -- The progress of the campaign of preparations for the parliamentary elections due to be held in France next March indicates that the Communists' election platform is receiving growing support from working people. This was declared by G. Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party [PCF], addressing a meeting held in the city of Les Mureaux (Yvelines Department).

Today, he noted, the grave consequences that will ensue for working people from the plans to cooperate with right-wing forces, which have been advanced by the socialist party in connection with the elections, are becoming increasingly obvious. By voting for the PCF candidates, G. Marchais pointed out, the voters can thwart the right-wing parties' attempts to return to power and their plans which will lead to aggravation of the difficulties being experienced by the country.

Going on to analyze the state of political forces in the country, the PCF secretary general drew attention to the activation of right-wing groupings. He recalled that the extreme right-wingers had failed to even nominate a presidential candidate in the 1981 presidential election campaign. They received only 0.3 percent of votes in the 1981 parliamentary elections, but 3 years later these organizations won over 10 percent of votes. Help in this was provided by right-wing parties which in fact supported the demagogic theses advanced by ultraright-wing groupings. Responsibility for the activation of the extreme right wing, G. Marchais pointed out, is also born by those who gave them the opportunity to use state television companies in their propaganda campaign.

The PCF secretary general also dwelt in detail on the proposals elaborated by French Communists aimed at the solution of the most acute problem of unemployment.

PRAVDA REITERATES SPECIAL STATUS OF WEST BERLIN

PM291539 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Stanislav Zyubanov article under the rubric "We Reply to Our Reader": "The Status of West Berlin" -- first paragraph is a PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] A.A. Chernyshov from Penza Oblast asks us to describe the status of West Berlin.

West Berlin enjoys a unique status under international law. The city is located in the heart of the territory of the sovereign socialist state of the GDR, but has a capitalist structure of life. This isolated entity does not belong to any state, has its own constitution, and is governed by the City Senate.

The Soviet Union repeatedly attempted, by means of talks with the allies, to normalize the situation around West Berlin which, for over 2 decades after the war, was objectively a "detonator of tension" in West Europe.

According to press reports, more than 90 intelligence and subversion organizations and over 60 revanchist and militarist leagues already existed there by the late fifties. Springer's yellow press cynically described West Berlin at the time as "a frontline city," "a pistol aimed at the heart of the GDR," "the cheapest atom bomb," and so forth.

Talks among the four great powers, which began at the USSR's initiative in March 1970, ended 3 September 1971 with the signing of the four-power agreement on West Berlin, which provided a sensible balance of mutual interests.

By means of this agreement the USSR, the United States, Britain, and France agreed that force or the threat of force must not be applied in this region and that disputes must be resolved exclusively by peaceful means.

The agreement unambiguously prohibits illegal activity in West Berlin on the part of Bonn and any attempts to make it appear that the city is part of FRG territory.

The agreement's central provision that West Berlin "is, as before, not a part of the FRG and will not be governed by it in the future" laid a proper foundation for the settlement of the FRG's political, economic, legal, and cultural relations with the city. The GDR and FRG governments concluded a transit communications agreement, the GDR authorities and the West Berlin Senate reached agreement on citizens' travel and visits, and questions of postal links between the two sovereign German states were also settled.

The subsequent opening of a USSR consulate general, Soviet foreign trade associations office, and an Aeroflot office in West Berlin contributed to a rapid expansion of trade between hundreds of West Berlin firms and USSR foreign trade associations and an increase in the city's cultural and tourist exchanges with the outside world.

The conclusion of the four-power agreement and the granting of a special political status to the city appreciably improved the atmosphere around West Berlin, ensured normal development for its population of almost 2 million, and enabled it to enjoy the fruits of detente. But the significance of this agreement goes far beyond the regional framework. After all, this case offered tangible justification of the fundamental principle of the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence -- talks on the solution of disputed international questions are not only useful and possible, but can also be successful, provided they are based on political realities and there is a desire for sensible coordination of interests.

Unfortunately, however, it must be stated that right-wing forces on the banks of the Rhine headed by the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union have still not abandoned their attempts to undermine West Berlin's special political status and at times act contrary to common sense, as if that city were part of the FRG's patrimony. All kinds of visits to the banks of the Spree by Bonn politicians in their official capacity and the illegal planting of various FRG institutions there are used for this purpose.

All these sly, and simultaneously dangerous, attempts run counter to the spirit and letter of the four-power agreement. No one will succeed in breaking West Berlin -- that highly important link -- away from the chain of European detente.

PASHKO COMMENTS ON UPCOMING SPANISH NATO VOTE

LD031522 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Vladimir Pashko commentary]

[Text] As has already been reported, the Spanish Government has announced that a referendum is to take place on 12 March on the question of NATO membership. The date is to be confirmed by Parliament on Tuesday during debates on the country's defense policy. At the microphone is commentator Vladimir Pashko.

The government's decision is an important victory by anti-NATO forces in Spain. Let me remind you that this country joined the North Atlantic bloc in '82, when the centrists were at the helm. The step provoked an extremely negative reaction in the country. The socialists, who won at the elections in that same year, promised the voters that they would freeze integration into NATO and would hold a referendum on this question. However, seated now at the ministerial desk, they have altered their position; they have begun to justify participation in NATO as a necessity of membership of the European Economic Community which has, in their words, opened up for Spain the hope of sharing the future of European civilization. It has taken the Spaniards a little less than 4 years to make the government fulfill the promise made to them. But the struggle itself is probably only just beginning. To relieve the pressure from its critics, the government states that it favors keeping NATO membership only under the condition of the non-deployment [nerazmeshcheniye] on its territory of nuclear weapons, a gradual cutback on the American military presence, and of Spain not joining the organization's military structure. But it is obvious to everyone that these conditions may be accepted by the North Atlantic alliance merely temporarily; at any moment the bloc can take steps in order to reduce them to nothing. As the Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain emphasized in this context on Friday, exit from NATO is the only guarantee that such a situation will be eliminated.

It is interesting to note that even the right-wing opposition has refused to support the government, having called on its supporters to boycott the referendum. Spaniards are well aware of the threat originating from NATO. As the national agency EFE noted, the referendum to decide the question of further membership in this organization is now the main subject of political debates. It is upon the outcome of the debates that the future security of Spain will to a large extent depend.

TASS NOTES RESUMPTION OF PAPAL MURDER PLOT TRIAL

LDO40743 Moscow TASS in English 0717 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] Rome, February 4 TASS -- The papal murder plot trial is being resumed here today. The trial, as the ITALIA NEWS AGENCY points out, is entering a concluding stage. The questioning of witnesses has been completed. Before a verdict is passed, it is also essential to analyze in detail the witnesses' testimony which has been gathered during two trips to Turkey and Switzerland where a number of members of the Turkish terrorist grouping "Grey Wolves" were questioned. As papal assailant, terrorist Mehmet Ali Agca, asserts, the members of the "Grey Wolves" were involved in the assassination attempt on the pope. Besides, the court is once again to hear Agca himself who fired on Pope John Paul the Second in May 1981.

The entire course of the trial, the news agency emphasizes, has shown the utter untenability of the preliminary investigation which was based solely on Agca's mendacious "exposures". It was he who slandered the Bulgarian citizens by imputing to them a certain complicity in the assassination attempt on the pope. It is precisely on the strength of his calumnies that an innocent Bulgarian citizen, Sergei Antonov, has been languishing in custody for more than three years now.

USSR-CUBA-ANGOLA TALKS ON SOUTHERN AFRICA CITED

MB010524 Moscow in Zulu to Southern Africa 1800 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] In Moscow, today Soviet, Cuban, and Angolan delegations held consultative talks on several topics. The agenda of the talks concentrated mainly on international problems, with special reference to the southern African region.

During the discussion of international problems, the participants stressed the need for making the Soviet proposals for better international relations and peace the basis for further diplomacy. The general secretary of the CPSU, Mikhail Gorbachev, has already informed the Western countries and the United States of his proposals. It was noted that if Soviet proposals were the basis for nuclear disarmament and the end of the nuclear arms race on earth and in space, such a development would greatly reduce the difficult situation in international affairs and aid the cause of peace and harmony.

The participants in the meeting agreed that the limitation and ultimate destruction of nuclear weapons should not be linked to regional conflicts as has been proposed by the United States in its aim to dominate the whole world. Such a linkage gives the United States an excuse to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, a development that would further exacerbate the already strained international relations between the Western and Eastern bloc nations. The meeting emphasized that the incidence of various regional conflicts poses a great danger to peace: The whole world can be engulfed in the flames of war. Thus it is important to take definitive and trustworthy steps to open talks, paying particular attention to the principle of respect for sovereignty of all nations within the framework of the international community.

In these discussions, the southern African situation was thoroughly discussed. It was noted that the brutal and barbaric apartheid regime, bolstered by capitalist-imperialist countries, mainly the United States, posed a dangerous problem which threatens to bedevil international relations. In South Africa, the indigenous African majority is waging a struggle for self-determination and the eradication of apartheid and discrimination. The Pretoria regime is under immense pressure.

In Namibia, the patriots have taken up arms to wage a war to free Namibia from South African capitalists and imperialists. South Africa's destabilization campaign against independent African countries in southern Africa has escalated. Both South African and U.S. insistent support for UNITA and their physical interference in Angola are aimed at toppling the socialist Government of Angola, thereby turning Angola into a playground for South African and Western capitalists and imperialists. The United States persists in maintaining its ties with South Africa under the auspices of the constructive engagement policy. These ties have been severely criticized worldwide, including by critics inside the United States itself.

The talks also reviewed the internal situation in Angola, where the government is faced with a critical situation because of U.S. and South African support for UNITA -- an act which cannot but be regarded as gross interference in Angola's domestic affairs.

The treaties of cooperation signed among the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Angola were reviewed. Also under scrutiny were resolutions passed by the UN Security Council between September and October 1985. The Soviet Union and Cuba strongly condemned, without reservation, attempts to sabotage Angolan sovereignty by strong arm methods and urged the immediate cessation of such attempts. They also expressed sympathy and solidarity with the Angolan people's struggle to preserve self-determination and independence in the land of their birth.

All three delegations to the meeting unanimously agreed that the southern African problem requires a speedy resolution by doing away with gangsterism and violence in politics and also stopping foreign interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign countries. The United Nations has a major role to play in this respect. Other organizations, such as the OAU and the Nonaligned Movement, can also play a constructive and supportive role. It was emphasized that the best remedy for diffusing the southern African situation would be Pretoria's and Washington's preparedness to respect the aims and aspirations of the people of Angola and Namibia. SWAPO, an organization with international accreditation to represent the people of Namibia, should also be given due respect and credit.

The Soviet Union, Angola, and Cuba are countries that are highly critical of South Africa's attempts to entrench its unlawful occupation of Namibia by conniving with Namibian sellouts and fools, by having them pose as a representative government of the people of Namibia. These three countries strongly believe that the Namibian problem needs prompt resolution by accepting UN resolutions on the matter, paying particular attention to UN Security Council Resolution 435. This is the only wise and clear method of resolving the Namibian issue.

The three delegations expressed unqualified support for the ongoing liberation struggle in South Africa to eradicate apartheid led by the ANC. They expressed solidarity and sympathy with the Free Nelson Mandela Movement and other long-term political prisoners campaign and also urged the end of so-called treason trials in South Africa. They demanded that the harassment of Winnie Mandela and other political activists cease forthwith, SADF and SAP troops be withdrawn from African townships in South Africa, the ANC of South Africa be unbanned, and the Angolan Government's proposals of September 1984 regarding the resolution of the problems allied to Namibian independence, that will be accompanied by peace, harmony, and security in that country, be accepted and implemented.

Angolan President Jose Eduardo dos Santos said on 8 January this year: The Angolan people's determination to solve problems in a spirit of goodwill through frank consultative talks with affected parties is the only sane and sober way of establishing peace and harmony in southern Africa. Today, 30 January, President Dos Santos reiterated his earlier statement. In that message, it is stressed that the security and peace of Angola and other independent African countries in the subcontinent will be forever subject to great danger if the apartheid regime continues to survive.

The Moscow talks will assist in preserving Angolan territorial sovereignty and also speed up the liberation process in South Africa.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON DUVALIER CRISIS IN HAITI

2d Fleet 'Close' to Haiti

LD031912 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Havana, February 3 TASS -- Ships of the U.S. Second Fleet today passed close to the shores of Haiti, on the way to the eastern part of the Caribbean, PRENSA LATINA news agency noted. The Pentagon's spokesman said that warships are sent there in connection with U.S. naval exercises starting in the Caribbean on Thursday. But political observers are of the opinion that the forces are concentrated in the area to show the United States readiness to resort to force if the events in Haiti assume a turn undesirable for the White House. In his recent statement the general secretary of the Central Committee of the United Party of Haitian Communists Rene Theodore pointed out that Washington has plans to stage a military intervention into Haiti to implant a puppet government there.

Strike Paralyzes Capital

LD040650 Moscow TASS in English 0645 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] Madrid, February 4 TASS -- A general strike against the Duvalier regime, which started on Monday, has virtually paralyzed the capital of the insular nation in the Caribbean, EFE news agency has reported.

In a dispatch from Port-au-Prince the news agency indicates that the strike is the biggest action to date against Haiti's "president-of-life" Jean-Claude Duvalier.

The campaign against the pro-American Duvalier clan, launched late in November last year, reached a high point a week ago when police shot at an anti-government demonstration in the port city of Cap Haitien in the country's north.

NICARAGUA PROTESTS SHULTZ MEETING WITH FDN

LD031738 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] New York, February 3 TASS -- The Nicaraguan government has strongly protested a meeting between U.S. Secretary of state George Shultz and the chieftains of a C.I.A.-bankrolled mercenary organization calling itself "The Nicaraguan Democratic Front."

That meeting, Nicaragua's permanent mission to the United Nations said in a letter to the U.N. Secretary-general, had borne out once again that the U.S. administration aimed to overthrow the lawful government of Nicaragua. It had also revealed, the letter added, the substance of the far-fetched pretexts and smear campaigns directed at getting the United States involved in an illicit and criminal war against the Sandinist popular revolution.